FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 004

7 January 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Losing 'Sense of Reality' in SDI Program [Bogachev] AA 1
U.S. Circles Use 'Trickery' To Further SDI Goals AA 1
[Palladin in IZVESTIYA 2 Jan]
Profits Provide Incentive for SDI Implementation [Kalyagin] AA 2
Geneva Progress Only Possible With SDI 'Rejection' [Krasikov] AA 3
Geneva Talks Depend on U.S. Actions in SDI [Druzhinin] AA 3
Proposed U.S. Chemical Weapons Program Decried AA 4
[Biryukov in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 1 Jan]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions and Answers' CC 1
[Lavrentyev, Shishlin, Savodyan, Baranov, Pasko]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Editorial Article Criticizes U.S. 'New Globalism' A 1
[PRAVDA 7 Jan]
Lomeyko Sees 'Anti-Sovietism' in New Policy A 3
'Interventionist Course' Aim of New Doctrine A 4
[Matveyev in IZVESTIYA 30 Dec]
Reagan, Madrid Meeting Shows U.S. Regional Plans [Levchenko] A 6
Former CIA Officer Details Plot To Kill Al-Nasir A 6
Private U.S. Group Plans 'Raid' in Indochina A 7

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japanese-U.S. SDI Accord Stems From Trade Tension C 1
[Agafonov in IZVESTIYA 4 Jan]
N. Korean Representatives Decry U.S-Korean Maneuvers C 2
Parliamentary Delegation Head [Myakota] C 2
Red Cross, Military [PRAVDA 5 Jan] C 2

SOUTH ASIA

Reagan, Pakistan Premier Remarks on Afghanistan Criticized D 1
Dzasokov-led Soviet Delegation Arrives in Kabul D 1
IZVESTIYA Views End of Martial Law in Pakistan as 'Farce' D 2
[31 Dec]
Moscow TV Commentary D 3

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Moscow TV Notes U.S. Concern Over Philippines E 1
SRV Foreign Ministry Cited on Paracel, Spratly Islands E 1
TASS Notes Cambodia's Successful Development E 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Brovikov Appointed New Ambassador to Poland F 1
Warsaw Report [Warsaw TV] F 1
More on Antonov Visit to Poland [PRAVDA 5 Jan] F 1

Growth of Party Ranks Discussed at PZPR Plenum [PRAVDA 5 Jan] F 2
Western Boycott Fails to 'Destabilize' Poland [PRAVDA 3 Jan] F 2
Ligachev Meets With Hungary's Horvath 6 Jan F 3
Yamburg Pipeline Agreement Signed With Hungary [PRAVDA 1 Jan] F 3
SFRY Economic Ills, Bilateral Ties Detailed F 3
[Pishchik in NEW TIMES No 49]

WESTERN EUROPE

Mitterrand Confirms Visit to USSR 'This Year' [TANJUG] G 1
Growth of Nuclear-Free Zones in UK Examined [Belitskiy] G 1
Chernyshev Comments on NATO Pressure on Spain [PRAVDA 4 Jan] G 2
Bonn Continues 'Hostile Campaign' Against DRA [Fadeyev] G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

PLO's Qaddumi Meets Polyakov in Moscow [AFP] H 1
Further Reportage on U.S.-Libyan Tensions H 1
'State of War' H 1
Target List Prepared [Kalyagin] H 1
U.S. Reveals Motives [Kalyagin] H 2
Lomeyko Press Conference H 2
'Retaliatory Measures' Contemplated H 3
U.S. 'Ready' To Strike [Shabayev] H 4
Israeli Planes on U.S. Carrier H 4
Italy Denies Report [Yuryev] H 5
Peace Supporters 'Concerned' H 5
Soviet TU's Statement H 6
Canada Rejects Sanctions H 7
Maltese Oppose Operations H 7
Al-Jumayyil Stresses Need for Israeli Withdrawal H 7
Lebanon Demands Security Council Meeting H 7
CPSU's Brutents Holds Seminar on Mideast [Kuwait AL-WATAN 4 Jan] H 8
PDRY's Premier Praises Near East Policy H 21
[Makharev in ZA RUBEZHOM No 1]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Soviet-Ethiopian Trade Ties Described J 1
Magazine Cited on CIA Operations in Africa [Serbin in PRAVDA 3 Jan] J 1
Reunion CP Leader Alleges CIA Activities J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Ponomarev Receives Peruvian Congressman 1 Jan [PRAVDA 1 Jan] K 1
De la Madrid Rejects U.S. Pressure on C. America K 1
Latest U.S. Maneuvers To 'Intimidate' Nicaragua K 1
Chilean Socialists Send Appeal to Armed Forces K 2
Factions in Paraguay Clash Over Political Reforms K 2

U.S. LOSING 'SENSE OF REALITY' IN SDI PROGRAM

LD062048 Moscow TASS in English 2033 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 6 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Notwithstanding the dense veil of secrecy surrounding work which is aimed at creating and testing U.S. systems for space-based anti-missile defence, information about "insurmountable obstacles", "technical problems" and "scientific setbacks" -- which are being encountered by engineers and scientists who have been hired by U.S. military agencies for the development of laser, beam and other strike weapons -- has filtered into the Western press of late. THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper has pointed out with irony that the "star wars" programme rapidly moves along but no one knows exactly in what direction.

Having encountered impartial criticism inside the country for spending billions-worth amounts of the taxpayers' money on the creation of an anti-missile shield which, as it turns out, is doomed to be holey, U.S. Administration spokesmen have to shift and dodge and at times let out the true purpose of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI).

John Gardner, director of a department of the SDI organization, recently announced that the realization of the SDI programme would sharply change the nuclear balance in favour of the United States. Venturesome scientist Edward Teller, one of the most zealous advocates of space militarization, recently voiced hope that the "star wars" programme would make the Soviet Union increase military expenditures. If this happens, it would mean that "we have already achieved something", he said. According to George Keyworth, the resigning adviser to the U.S. President, the "star wars" programme, it transpires, envisages the creation of not a shield over America but that of a dome over the Soviet Union. Such statements by U.S. Administration spokesmen are indicative, on the one hand, of the loss of a sense of reality by them, and on the other hand, of the full priority of the military-industrial complex (MIC) interests over the security interests of the U.S. people in the tackling of international problems by Washington.

The Pentagon's calculations to achieve U.S. military superiority by deploying strike weapons in outer space are built on sand. The Soviet Union will find effective means to counteract the weapon systems, and the reply move will be rapid enough and less costly than the U.S. "star wars" programme.

At present, there is still a possibility to stop the dangerous development of events in outer space. Tomorrow, it may prove much more difficult to do. The Soviet Union has solemnly announced that it will never be the first to go into outer space with weapons. It is ready to observe in good faith all the accords reached during the November summit meeting in Geneva and to press for the dialogue with the United States to be continued in a constructive spirit and result in concrete solutions to lessen the nuclear war danger.

U.S. CIRCLES USE 'TRICKERY' TO FURTHER SDI GOALS

PM061311 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent A. Palladin: "Space Trickery"]

[Text] Washington -- Through the efforts of U.S. military-political circles, trickery and deception have reached literally cosmic heights.

By plugging the idea of "star wars" the Pentagon and its patrons and allies are deliberately misleading the U.S. public and Congress and the Western countries which the White House is seeking to harness to the chariot of its militarist policy.

Washington officials, THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER writes in this connection, have launched a misinformation campaign. They are passing off as extremely successful tests which scientists who were involved in them have described as unsuccessful. Moreover, the paper notes, R. Reagan continues to call the "star wars" plans nonnuclear, although they presuppose the use of nuclear-triggered lasers which would be activated by "exploding hydrogen bombs in space."

Another major local paper, the LOS ANGELES TIMES, devoted a detailed article by Robert Scheer to the problem. Three years ago R. Scheer published a book, titled "With Enough Shovels" in which he exposed the aggressive designs of prominent representatives of the present U.S. Administration and he is now producing equally persuasive material telling all there is to know about the preparations to militarize space. Citing one of the leaders of the "star wars" project, U.S. Air Force Colonel George Hess, he writes that the Pentagon intends to place nuclear reactors in near-earth orbit, since without them the planned system would not be able to function. Yet, R. Scheer points out, the White House head extols the "Strategic Defense Initiative" in all his speeches as bringing deliverance from nuclear weapons.

At the same time, the LOS ANGELES TIMES quotes several examples of representatives of the U.S. military-industrial complex, including Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, spreading what they know to be false information about progress in work on space weapons for a different purpose -- to give the impression that everything is proceeding without a hitch and even ahead of schedule. The leaders of this work are vying with one another in boasting about "unprecedented successes" and, to make it more convincing, they put on television shows to demonstrate their "achievements."

The writer of the article stresses that supporters of "star wars" need the window dressing in order to overcome widespread doubts in the United States about the venture, to secure multibillion-dollar appropriations from Congress, and at the same time, to enlist the governments of the leading Western states as accomplices. The deception is aided, R. Scheer adds, by the fact that U.S. scientists and experts who know about these things are frightened to tell the truth since the penalty for divulging a state secret is imprisonment.

PROFITS PROVIDE INCENTIVE FOR SDI IMPLEMENTATION

LD062300 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1953 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpts] In the first days of the New Year observers traditionally make forecasts for the future and try to define what 1986 will be like for our world. The majority express the hope that the international atmosphere in the coming year will become more favorable and that those changes for the better which came about due to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will be followed up. The New Year appeals by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the people of the United States and of U.S. President Reagan to the people of the Soviet Union have become a symbol of such a course of events.

However, one should not close one's eyes to the fact that problems of cutting nuclear missiles and preventing the militarization of space are not yet resolved. The constructive search for agreement on these issues is the most important task which our country is faced with in the international field.

We are ready to go our half of the way. Unfortunately, the same cannot yet be said of the United States.

The space plans of Washington arouse special anxiety. The U.S. Administration in league with its military-industrial complex is creating the political and economic basis necessary to implement the plans for "star wars" at an increasing pace. The prospect of making unprecedented profits make President Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative uncommonly attractive for the leading U.S. military corporations. They regard it as the main field of growth in income for the coming decade. Already the leading U.S. military-industrial concerns are putting powerful pressure on representatives of the administration as well as on Congress, demanding further headway in the militarization of space.

GENEVA PROGRESS ONLY POSSIBLE WITH SDI 'REJECTION'

LD032157 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Jan 86

[Commentary by TASS political observer Anatoliy Krasikov]

[Excerpts] The first days of the New Year have confirmed our country's firm resolve to strive for a change for the better in the international situation. They have showed that we will continue to do everything to remove the danger of a destructive nuclear conflict from the life of the peoples forever.

The West's military-industrial complex, which makes incredible profits out of the arms race, has obstructed and will continue to obstruct accord and will obstruct a lessening of international tension. We know that this New Year has inherited an entire series of talks from the previous one on the most crucial problems of international life.

Our country put forward clear and specific proposals with regard to each of these problems for discussion by our partners. The Soviet Union proposed reducing Soviet and U.S. nuclear resources by half at the Geneva talks, but it goes without saying that progress at the Geneva talks is possible only on the condition of a complete prohibition of space strike weapons. In other words, it requires a rejection of the "star wars" program, the implementation of which will lead to a qualitatively new, uncontrollable stage in the arms race.

The Soviet Union insists that all nuclear weapons tests be completely stopped. Our country favors the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and the creation of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world. Naturally, attainment of success in solving peace and disarmament questions depends not only upon us.

GENEVA TALKS DEPEND ON U.S. ACTIONS IN SDI

LD061646 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Aleksandr Druzhinin commentary]

[Text] When the Soviet Union and the United States issued their joint statement 1 year ago on 8 January 1985 they defined explicitly what should be done to stop the arms race. The two nations set these goals: no militarization of space, no more increase in nuclear stocks on earth, limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons, and greater strategic stability. Last November these goals were reaffirmed at the Geneva summit and it's noteworthy that the leaders of both countries gave priority to preventing an arms race in space. Needless to say this is the only approach that can bring about effective arms control.

Even if nuclear arsenals were substantially reduced on earth, putting weapons in space would nullify this achievement because doing so would have unforeseeable consequences. It would result in strategic chaos and inaugurate an entirely new state of the arms race, a stage impossible to control. So it's clear that progress at the pending talks in Geneva will depend on whether the Soviet Union and the United States reach agreement on what is most important -- a total ban on strike space weapons.

The Soviet Union has all along insisted that the doors to space must be barred to an arms race. Unfortunately, the United States sees things differently. It continues to push its "star wars" program and, more than that, it is pressuring its NATO allies to get into the program. On the eve of the New Year the United States staged an underground nuclear explosion in the State of Nevada to test a device that will supply nuclear energy to a sophisticated laser weapon. This test can only be seen as a sign that Washington has not decided against developing strike space weapons which means it is not living up to the understanding reached at the Geneva summit. It is acting against the spirit of Geneva. If the United States continues in the same dangerous direction there is no hope for real progress in arms control.

PROPOSED U.S. CHEMICAL WEAPONS PROGRAM DECRIED

PM031139 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 1 Jan 86 p 3

[Article by Vadim Biryukov under the "International Notes" rubric: "Chasing After Profit"]

[Text] The U.S. newspaper THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER recently published an article devoted to the U.S. congressional examination of a bill providing for the earmarking in fiscal 1986 of nearly $1.1 billion to the military-industrial complex for "the program to modernize chemical armaments." The newspaper reported, in a strikingly well-informed way, how the Pentagon intends to use this money on the research and development of "new supertoxic chemicals for warheads; the production of vaccines and antidotes, sensors, protective clothing, shelters, and computer programs simulating combat situations using chemical weapons;" and the production of 155-mm artillery shells and 200-kg Big Eye bombs filled with nerve gasses.

In trying to persuade the U.S. Congress that chemical weapons stocks in the United States are in some way "obsolete" or "inadequate," the military-industrial complex is primarily concerned about its own profits. The monopolists are little concerned by the fact that an additional financial burden will be placed on the shoulders of U.S. taxpayers. This is being done despite the fact that at least 150,000 tons of toxins -- a quantity sufficient to destroy the entire population of the world -- are stored in U.S. arsenals.

The newspaper's report puts us on our guard. It is obvious that the U.S. military-industrial complex has entirely specific plans for improving and producing new, particularly dangerous types of chemical weapons and you form the impression that is does not intend to abandon them. Yet the joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the results of the Geneva summit meeting explicitly states: "In the context of the discussion of security problems the sides confirmed that they are in favor of a universal and total ban on chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles of these weapons. They have agreed to activate efforts to conclude an effective and verifiable international convention on this score."

The Geneva meeting's long-term importance will be revealed in specific, practical deeds and depends on the sides'readiness to act on the basis of the joint statement adopted. It is obvious that the time has come when we must move from words to deeds and take practical steps to ban and destroy stockpiles of chemical weapons.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS'

LD040549 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 3 Jan 86

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" presented by Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, All-Union Radio commentator with Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer; Boris Savodyan, correspondent in Kabul; Yuriy Baranov, correspondent in Managua; and Vladimir Pasko, international affairs writer]

Soviet-U.S. Relations

[Excerpts] [Lavrentyev] As always, many listeners are interested in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations. Their letters express approval for the Soviet Union's foreign policy and our government's persistent search for paths toward detente and towards curbing the arms race. I summarized the questions on this topic contained in listeners' letters and asked political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin to answer them. Nikolay Vladimirovich, is it now possible to say that there was a change for the better in 1985 in Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Shishlin] Let's look first of all at the makeup of Soviet-U.S. relations and at the result of their development in the past year. It goes without saying that the central event in Soviet-U.S. relations was the Geneva summit meeting. And you know, basically, what the results of Geneva were. A sufficiently binding Soviet-U.S. statement was adopted there, in which a very fine thing is set forth: that nuclear was is inadmissible and that neither side will strive military superiority. An understanding of the need to speed up the negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on space and nuclear weapons was reached. And the aims and subject of these negotiations were confirmed, that is, to halt the arms race on Earth and to prevent its transfer to space.

In general, even more can probably be credited to Geneva than what I have just said, but one way or another, we, of course, are right to assess the meeting itself and its results as positive. Geneva in fact produced another document on Soviet-U.S. relations -- the general agreement on the development of contacts in the fields of science, education and culture. This general agreement will probably in itself produce some kind of material results. One can already mention such things as the agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on the resumption of air communications between our countries, that is, on the flights of the U.S. Pan American company to the Soviet Union and of the Soviet Aeroflot company to the United States; on the opening of a Soviet Consulate in New York and a U.S. consulate in Kiev; and a number of other practical agreements.

But I think that when we come to consider the results of 1985 and its legacy for the new year, we must also speak about the Geneva accord regarding the continuation of meetings at summit level, and 1986 should be marked by another Soviet-U.S. summit.

All this is certainly on the credit side, on the plus side; it all makes for a good start to 1986. But one must not close one's eyes to the fact that at Geneva there was no success in reaching agreement on the cardinal problems concerned with stopping the arms race on Earth and preventing its spread into space. And it seems to me than when we now speak and consider whether there was progress or no progress toward an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, then I think we ought to take our cue from the true assessment of what took place which was given in the latest official Soviet statements.

There was a certain rapprochement in positions, or rather the potential for a coming together of positions. And I think, if we are speaking accurately, in accordance with the realities, we must say that 1985 created opportunities for a turn to the better in Soviet-U.S. relations, opportunities. The year 1985 created the prerequisites for a turning point in Soviet-U.S. relations and for the easing of international relations as such. To make something of these opportunities, to make something of these prerequisites, is the task for 1986.

[Lavrentyev] What prevented the achievement of greater progress?

[Shishlin] Well, of course, the most serious and important obstacle to the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, to the improvement of these relations, remains the absence of agreement on the key problem of our times -- the problem of stopping the arms race. And just look at the picture that emerges. The Soviet Union, as you know, has supported and still supports the discontinuance of nuclear tests in all environments. And the Soviet example of good will in this respect is in everyone's memory. But how did the United States act? Just before the new year they carried out another test of a nuclear weapon, one with a power of 150 kilotons, 10 times the power of the charge that destroyed the Japanese city of Hiroshima. And the United States says quite plainly that it will go on testing nuclear weapons. And not for the sake of testing, of course, but in order to create new types of nuclear weapons.

All these tests are for the purpose of equipping those strategic missiles which are to appear in the U.S. arsenal in coming years. They carry out these tests in order to create a nuclear pump for the laser which they hope to use in the notorious "star wars" program, to which they cling with all their might.

I believe a great deal is at stake in 1986. One can utter fine words, one can declare one's desire for peace -- the U.S. politicians do that. But if they do not have the political will to seek compromises with the Soviet Union on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security of both sides, as far as a reduction in the level of military confrontation is concerned, then of course Soviet-U.S. relations will mark time, or even progress.

However, the prerequisites, I repeat, for a turn for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations, do exist. But much will depend of course, on the political climate. I have in mind, of course, the positive things that exist, (?such as) the exchange of New Year's greetings by the leaders of both countries. And it seems to me that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is quite right when he says that it is essential to introduce trust into Soviet-U.S. relations, that it is essential to overcome the deficit of trust. But how can this be done most effectively? Of course it is probably possible to speak, as I have already mentioned, about certain practical areas of mutual relations. One can utter new words to the effect that it is essential to establish better working relations with the Soviet Union. But the decisive test lies in one area only -- in the military sphere. Trust will emerge when the Soviet Union and the United States manage to move away from the arms race to the curbing of the arms race. And the arena for this -- the political arena -- has been cleared by the Soviet Union. In January the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons restart, and I think that they ought to show a great deal.

[Lavrentyev] Nikolay Vladimirovich, what can be hoped for in 1986?

1986 Tasks

[Shishlin] Making forecasts is of course a thankless task, but as far as international politics and international relations are concerned the interest in how the world will develop, in how the fate of the world will shape up, is so great that one must contemplate what we can expect in the new year. As far as the task for 1986 is concerned, that is perfectly clear: the task is to materialize those good intentions and good statements that accompanied the end of 1985 and the very first day of 1986. This is the main thing, the key matter. And I want to stress again and again that much will depend on how the negotiations in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons progress. In essence, the basis for agreement exists there, and although naturally the Soviet proposals and the U.S. counterproposals are far from symmetrical, and differ substantially, nonetheless if there is a common understanding of the inadmissibility of the deployment of the "star wars" program, then a coming together of the sides' positions on strategic offensive arms and on medium-range nuclear arms is within the bounds of the attainable, is possible.

Further, in 1986, it seems to me, it would be quite realistic to come to some sort of positive result at the Stockholm Conference which is discussing confidence-building measures and security in Europe. There the contours of a possible agreement are already being sketched out, and of course success at Stockholm would be a success for international relations.

At the beginning of 1986 we may also speak of some modest steps forward at the Vienna talks on the reduction of arms and armed forces in Central Europe. I am intentionally speaking about talks concerning the problem of curbing the arms race since these issues remain the main ones in 1986. And I think that progress at the negotiations I have mentioned would of course create the appropriate political climate for solid results from the expected Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which is to be held in 1986 in the United States.

But I wish to speak about more than just this in connection with my hopes for 1986. We should not look at the world tomorrow and the day after tomorrow only through the prism of Soviet-U.S. relations. I think 1986 will see a further enrichment of our relations with the socialist countries, both with the members of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA, and with countries which do not belong to these organizations, particularly with China. I think that 1986 will substantially enrich the relations of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries with the states of the Nonaligned Movement, especially as 1986 is the year of a new conference of nonaligned states, and the role and authority of this movement is currently growing. I think that 1986 will be characterized by an intensification of our dialogue with the developed capitalist countries, not only with the United States. And in this respect even January will be fairly typical, since in that month Soviet-Japanese talks at foreign minister level are due to take place.

In other words, the foreign policy calendar for 1986 looks busier than ever. But it would be splendid if that tense calendar led to a reduction in international tension. And the prerequisites for this, I repeat, exist. And as for the Soviet Union, its desire for peace, its readiness to seek sensible compromises, to find these compromies, guided by the principle of equality and equal security of both sides, on that account there can of course be no doubts at all.

Afghanistan Situation

[Lavrentyev] Viktor Mikhaylovich Gorokhov from Cherepovets asks us to describe the situation in Afghanistan. I passed on the contents of his letter to our correspondent in Kabul, Boris Savodyan.

[Savodyan] In the past year there has been progress in all spheres of life in Afghanistan. Industrial output exceeded the prerevolutionary level. Planned targets for the production of wheat, barley, vegetables and fruit were achieved, and the peasant cooperatives increased their sales of these to the state considerably. The second stage of the Kabul house-building combine went into service, a number of Afghan-Soviet economic cooperation projects were put into operation, the wages of office and manual workers increased, and the ranks of the PDPA and youth and other mass public organizations perceptibly strengthened. A new step on the path toward expanding and strengthening the democratic foundations of Afghan society today came with the recently-started local government elections. These have already been completed in seven of the country's provinces and also in Kabul and a number of districts in Kabul Province. The election of people's representatives is a vivid manifestation of the democratization of society and the striving by the Afghan leadership to ensure that the working people take an actual part in the running of the state and widen the social basis of the April Revolution. The Afghan people approve the progressive social and economic reforms that are being carried out in the country. This is shown by the recent meeting of the Loya Jirga, the high assembly of representatives of the Afghan people, and the meeting of the Supreme Jirga, the council of border tribes. The decisions they adopted met with a positive response from the most varied levels and groups of the Afghan population. Representatives of these groups are stating their readiness to further the process of the normalization in the country and to support the party and state bodies and the republic's armed forces in their action to prevent counterrevolutionary bands from penetrating the country from outside. All this shows that the attempts by the counterrevolution to wreck the country's development have ailed.

Nonetheless, the past year has not been an easy one for Afghanistan and perhaps has been the most difficult one. The authorities have had to work on the solution of a number of problems including the elimination of illiteracy, making health care accessible to all, housing construction, transport, and the border situation. Every people and every state has its problems in life, but too many of them perhaps have befallen Afghanistan. And attempts have to be made to solve them in a country against which war is being waged, where just some 10 or so years ago ancestral feudal relations were dominant, and where the heavy burden of the past weighs on the country to this day. It is therefore too early to say that the entire population of Afghanistan has gone over decisively onto the side of the revolution and support the government's policy aimed at saving them from poverty and darkness.

In these conditions, the Afghan leadership see as one of their chief tasks the raising of the awareness of the masses. The priority task, Babrak Karmal stressed at a recent PDPA Central Committee plenum, is to widen the influence brought to bear on the masses and to acquire new friends and political allies. Only in this way, and precisely in this way, will we be able to isolate and subsequently destroy the counterrevolutionary forces. The past year was a period of enormous deprivation for the Afghan people because of the armed aggression from outside. It showed yet again that the destiny of the Afghan revolution is no easy one; it has many enemies, but a considerably greater number of friends.

Easter Island

[Lavrentyev] Listener Vladimir Mikhaylovich Razhnov, from the village of (?Shetochnaya) in the Gorkiy Oblast asks: Is it true that there is a U.S. military base on Easter Island?

An agreement was signed between Chile -- to which Easter Island belongs -- and the United States in November 1985. This gives the Pentagon permission to settle down on the island and to extend the airfield there. Let me recall that Easter Island is situated in the Pacific, 3,800 km from the coast of South America. It began to be talked about after sensational archaeological excavations carried out there under Thor Heyerdahl.

Washington gave as the official reason for its request to the Chilean Government the fact that it is planned to commence flights by the Challenger and Columbia shuttle spacecraft in a polar orbit in 1986. The airfield on Easter Island, they say, might be suitable in the event of an emergency landing by the craft. The Pentagon intends not merely to widen and lengthen the airstrip considerably, but to take aerospace apparatus to the island. Pinochet's military junta met Washington's plan with delight. It wants to tie the country more tightly to the U.S.-NATO chariot, counting upon generous military and financial aid. The situation of the military regime in the country is now so shaky that Pinochet is willing to sell off, wholesale and retail, the whole of the country's wealth, just to remain in power. This kind of irresponsible approach on the part of the junta gives rise to deep concern among many Chileans. It has become known that the Pentagon needs the base on Easter Island in order to implement a space program which is military in character and which is closely linked with the "star wars" plans. Many authoritative figures in Chile and other Latin American countries consider that the new U.S. strategic base threatens not just the cultural values of Easter Island but the whole region. In the event of nuclear war, said Radomiro Tomic, one of the leaders of the Christian Democratic Party, the Chilean people will become the Pentagon's hostages. A heated discussion has now arisen around this problem in Chile. A group of eminent political figures, representatives of the intelligentsia and church circles, have demanded that the leader of the junta put this issue forward for discussion by the whole people. Pinochet's obliging attitude toward Washington has undermined his prestige among Chile's population even more.

Central America

A question on Central America. Despite the efforts by the Contadora group, the conflict in Central America is assuming a more and more threatening dimension. What is preventing a peace settlement in the region, and what is the position of the Nicaraguan Government on the problem? This is asked by Comrades Darmshchuk from Moscow and Vladimir Petrovich Khokhlov from Kursk. The reply is given by our correspondent in Nicaragua, Yuriy Baranov.

[Baranov] I think that the answer should be sought in the actual content of the conflict which the people who are truly to blame for the tension are trying to conceal. U.S. diplomacy is trying to present the exacerbation of the situation in Central America as one manifestation of the East-West confrontation, with the idea being set in motion that Nicaragua represents a military threat to its neighbors. It is noteworthy that the members of the Contadora group, at their very first meeting 3 years ago and at their subsequent meetings, immediately rejected the attempts to present the conflict in that light. A letter sent on November 11 by the Nicaraguan president to the members of the Contadora group and to the so-called support group for its peace efforts clearly sets out the position of the Nicaraguan Government. A solution to the conflict in the region, the letter says, inevitably and primarily lies through achieving agreement with the U.S. Government on ending the barbarous aggression against the Nicaraguan people and its pledge to renounce a policy of war against Nicaragua in the future. The recent decision by the U.S. Administration to supply counterrevolutionary bands operating in Nicaragua with means of transportation, including aircraft, seagoing launches and other equipment, and with new surface-to-air missile weaponry -- one of which was put into operation on 2 December against a Nicaraguan transport helicopter -- indicates that the United States not only has no intention of abandoning its policy to overthrow the revolutionary government of Nicaragua by means of the Somozist mercenaries, but is preparing to undertake direct armed intervention in the country. That is why the U.S. Administration is torpedoing the peace efforts of the Contadora group. It was under pressure from the United States that a revised version of the document called the Peace Act was made to include clauses that Nicaragua could not sign without doing serious damage to its national security interests.

In this situation, the members of the Contadora group made the decision to suspend talks on these issues for 5 months. The decision was welcomed with satisfaction by the Nicaraguan Government, which is of the opinion that this will enable the Central American countries, together with the members of the Contadora group, to work out a new approach to the problem of Central America that would include the demand for an immediate end to the criminal aggression by the United States against Nicaragua and the ending of U.S. interference in the internal affairs of the Central American countries.

Pashtun Tribes

[Lavrentyev] Many of your letters, comrades, contain the request for us to talk about the Pashtun people. The reports of punitive acts by the Pakistani regime against these tribes give rise to legitimate indignation among people. This is what is said in particular in the letters from Mariya Sergeyevna Voytsekhovskaya from Rostov-on-Don, Vitaliy Vladimirovich Rogovtsev from Yoshkar-Ola, Comrades Pomerantsev from Ufa and Pridkhodko from Uralsk, and pensioner Sulin from the town of (?kimry) near Moscow. Here is Vladimir Pasko, writer on international affairs.

[Pasko] Pashtun is the ethnic name of Afghan tribes who live in vast territories in Afghanistan and Pakistan. History has been cruel to this proud and freedom-loving people. In the middle of the last century the age-old Pashtun lands became the object of colonial seizure by the British crown. In 1893, Britain foisted an agreement on the amir of Afghanistan according to which it included the lands of the east Pashtun tribes in its empire. After 1947 that territory became part of Pakistan. At present about 8 million pashtuns live in Afghanistan and make up 55 percent of its population. About 10 million live in Pakistan, where the Pashtuns make up one-eighth of the population. On both sides of the border the Pashtuns have retained their ancestral tribal way of life with all its features. They are engaged chiefly in land cultivation and nomadic livestock breeding, but this is no longer able to give them a proper way of life. The lands on which the Pashtuns live are exceedingly poor and dry.

Following the victory of the April Revolution in Afghanistan, the Pashtuns received aid from the state for the first time. The republic sent agronomists, irrigation engineers and doctors to them. High-grade seeds, fertilizer and equipment was allocated to them. For the first time, the tribes in the remote regions were able to receive education, read, listen to the radio, and watch television programs in their own language. All this, of course, did not go unnoticed by their brothers in Pakistan. During the September assembly of Pashtun tribes, they sent their representatives to Kabul. Together with the Afghan pashtuns, they spoke out against any aid being given from tribal territory to the enemies of the Afghan revolution. Judging by the publications, the subsequent events were as follows. The first to deal a rebuff to the bandit gangs was the Afridi tribe. The Pakistani Government moved its troops against them, but the Afridi were supported by the Shinwari tribe. At a joint meeting they stated that they would not lay down their arms until government troops were completely withdrawn from the Khyber region, where those tribes live. They demanded, however, not only the elimination of Afghan counterrevolutionary bases, but also an extension of their electoral rights. Those demands, according to the information available, were supported by other tribes, too. This, of course, Ziaul Haq could not put up with. Having blocked off the area where the Pashtuns live, the Pakistani Army attempted to suppress the rebels. To quote the British GUARDIAN, never since the times of the British empire had expeditions on such a scale been undertaken against the tribes of the northwest border province. Information from the battle areas is scarce. The Pakistani authorities have been preventing it from leaving the country. The only source of information appears to be the Pashtun tribes themselves. The Western press, however, is in no hurry to publish it, which in fact is not surprising. The action taken by Islamabad against the Pashtuns is not only an extremely crude violation of the constitutional status of the tribal zone and their traditions and ways, but also a scandalous violation of human rights.

EDITORIAL ARTICLE CRITICIZES U.S. 'NEW GLOBALISM'

PM061635 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "Who Is Opposed to the Normalization of International Relations?"]

[Text] That the situation in the world is tense, and in individual regions is plainly dangerous, is a grim reality today. The interests of each people and the interests of international security in general demand that measures be taken to improve the existing situation and that this be done without delay. There is a pressing need for concrete steps to open up the possibility of finding just and peaceful settlements to the conflict situations.

He who believes he can profit by tension in individual parts of the world, let alone deliberately bring it to a critical level, acts more irresponsibly, playing with the destinies of millions of people. Life itself dictates that this policy should be done away with if there really is a wish to achieve a radical change for the better in international affairs and put state-to-state relations on a solid, stable footing.

It is for this goal that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries press consistently and persistently. Member states of the Non-aligned Movement speak out for a peaceful solution to regional problems ever more categorically. One distinguishing feature of this period is that there is an ever greater awareness among different public sections throughout the world that the situation where whole peoples are denied the right to decide their destinies and to follow an independent path of development is inadmissible and amoral.

The following legitimate question is in order: Why hasn't it been possible then to defuse the tension persisting in many regions for years and why do there emerge new seats of conflict in addition to the already existing "hot spots"? The answer apparently is that somebody is interested in this and benefits from disorganized international relations.

Who is it? The state that stands against constructive change in the world and is opposed to the resolution of regional problems does not even conceal that it intends to go on executing a policy which is based on a complete disregard for the interests of other peoples and countries.

U.S. leaders have been stressing in their recent statements that U.S. long-term policy is oriented at "most diverse conflicts halfway between a large-scale war and a universal peace." U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz explained that in Washington they do not plan to "live in an absolute peace."

When the man in charge of U.S. foreign policy declares that there will be no universal peace, he says in effect that there will be no peace because the United States is not interested in it. The realities of the present world situation and, the fact that there are now dozens of states on the international scene whose views and policies differ from the U.S., does not suit the United States.

In Washington they are irked when the people of this or that country decides to build its life as it sees fit rather than as somebody else would like it to. This is why the states that have suffered greatly from colonialism and imperialist exploitation and which reject the capitalist way of development become the target of broadsides and threats.

In the United States they do not like it when this or that country chooses its friends itself rather than on instructions from Washington.

So they "blacklist" such a country, impose a blockage against it, threaten it with aggression, and openly plan the forcible removal of its leaders.

Every time this or that state makes the sovereign decision to deliver itself from the web of U.S. military bases and U.S. nuclear weapons on its territory, they fly into a rage in Washington. Sanctions immediately follow. U.S. propaganda subjects such a country to a kind of "civil" punishment" ["grazhdanskaya kazn"].

According to U.S. yardsticks, only a country which follows in line behind the United States without a murmur is sovereign and independent. Things have gone so far that whenever a state votes in the United Nations for peace and disarmament and for removing the nuclear threat, this is regarded as a criminal case.

Countries which dare to do so are considered unreliable. It appears that those who are fond of talking about a commitment to peace regard a real commitment to peace as a punishable offense.

Since U.S. imperial ambitions have been clashing more and more often with reality and with the interests of most of the states of the world, Washington has begun to look for ways to put things right. But it has set out to do so not by revising its own behavior, but by trying to change the surrounding world by force.

Now Washington is extolling the concept of "new globalism" in U.S. foreign policy as a great discovery. This slogan can be summarized as the assertion of the U.S. right to intervene in the affairs of sovereign states on a global scale, to wage undeclared wars and covert and overt subversive operations against them, and to pursue a policy of state terrorism.

The peoples of the Middle East, Central America and southern Africa are well aware of the worth of this "new globalism." It leaves in its wake the old, self-same traces of U.S. imperialism, namely, ruin, blood, and tears.

If there is something really new in this policy it is an attempt to make international arbitrariness and violence a common cause of the West. The United States is trying hard to involve its military allies in "new globalism." This task seems far from easy. Even the most dependable U.S. friends shrink from letting themselves be associated with such actions as the bombing of peaceful Lebanese cities or the rape of defenseless Grenada. So Washington has to mask its banditry as a "sacred struggle against communism."

There is one more aspect to the policy of "new globalism" that is being pursued today. Its core is the self-same militant anti-Sovietism and a feverish search for ways to secure military superiority over the Soviet Union. From the Pentagon's point of view, the world as a whole is a potential theater of operations, while individual countries constitute potential arms depots and barracks for U.S. troops.

If we take a look at the past, outbursts of U.S. "regional preoccupation," strangely enough, coincided with those periods which saw signs of a change for the better in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and opportunities to reach accord on certain measures in the determining sphere of security. Today, too, influential forces are growing more active in the United States in a bid to prevent any improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations.

They were scared by the positive results of the Geneva summit and are now attacking its effects. As Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has noted, there has been launched in the United States "a massive campaign against the normalization of relations with the USSR and the building of mutual trust in Soviet-U.S. relations, on which the sides agreed in Geneva."

The Soviet -U.S. summit provided favorable preconditions for starting a constructive dialogue on regional problems as well. The Soviet side clearly stated in Geneva that there was a need for a new policy, not in the least on the settlement of conflict situations, and that the United States should give up inflated notions about spheres of its vital interests and respect the national interests of all countries.

Stress was laid on the readiness of the Soviet Union to constructively cooperate with all countries, including the United States, in working out fair and honest political solutions to the existing regional problems. We consider such solutions necessary and possible. This matter concerns all countries without exception -- big, medium, and small alike. Progress in that direction could drastically help improve the international situation and remove obstacles on the way to a lasting peace.

LOMEYKO SEES 'ANTI SOVIETISM' IN NEW POLICY

LD061404 Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 6 TASS -- The tense and even explosive situation in different parts of the world calls for concrete measures for its fair peaceful settlement, Vladimir Lomeyko. chief of the Press Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, said at a briefing on present-day international problems at the press centre of the Soviet Foreign Ministry today. This is the principled stand of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The nonaligned countries and also more and more forceful in putting across a similar position.

However, the ruling circles of the USA are not happy that there dozens of countries all over the world the views and policies of which are at odds with those of America. [sentence as received] So Washington "blacklists" those states which do not choose freiencds on Washington's bidding. It mounts blockades of those states, threatens them with agression, and openly plans to remove their leaders.

New open threats to Libya, Syria, and Nicaragua have been issued by Washington during the past few days. On other cases Washington's clients, such as Israel and South Africa, are used for the purpose.

This policy has now been even theoretically enshrined in a concept of "new globalism." It boils down to the assertion of the right of the United States to intervene on a global scale in the affairs of sovereign states and to pursue a policy of state terrorism against them.

U.S. leaders have been stressing in their recent statements that U.S. policy is oriented to very different conflicts between an all-out war and universal peace.

The peoples of the Middle East, Central America, southern Africa and other parts of the world well know the world of this "new globalism."

If there is anything new in this policy, it is an attempt to turn international arbitrariness and violence into a common cause of the West and to involve Washington's military allies in "new globalism."

There is one more aspect to this policy. It is anti-Sovietism and a feverish search for ways to secure military superiority over the Soviet Union. It is in this way that the Pentagon views the world.

It is symptomatic that outbursts of "regional preoccuption" in Washington always coincide with those periods when opportunities appear in relations between the USSR and the USA to reach agreement on measures concerning the central issues of lessening the war threat.

Today, too, influential forces are growing more and more active in the USA in a bid to prevent an improvement in Soviet-American relations. Scared by the positive results of the summit, they have mounted an attack on its effects.

The meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan created favourable preconditions for starting constructive dialogue on regional problems as well. The Soviet side stressed its readiness to cooperate with all states, including the USA, to find fair solutions to regional conflicts. We consider such solutions necessary and possible.

'INTERVENTIONIST COURSE' AIM OF NEW DOCTRINE

PM021049 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion": "A Thankless and Risky Business"]

[Text] "We will litter the ground with corpses from the Honduran border to the capital, Managua..." What latter-day follower of the butchers of Dachau can have said that? The U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK was quoting one of the cutthroats who hold sway in the counter-revolutionary gangs formed by CIA and Pentagon emissaries and sent to commit acts of terrorism on Nicaraguan territory.

Washington continues to fulminate against "international terrorism," but it keeps silent about the deaths of hundreds and thousands of victims of terrorists financed and equipped by the United States. Eleven thousand Nicaraguan citizens have been killed as a result of "contra" actions.

Through the fault of the same people, blood is being spilled in Angola, Afghanistan, and a number of other countries. A brochure entitled "Reagan's Secret Wars," published in the United States at the beginning of November by the public organization the Center for National Security Studies, points out that the number of CIA operations has increased at least fivefold under the current U.S. Administration. U.S. special services are now running more that 50 large-scale secret operations abroad and are, to all intents and purposes, waging war against the lawful governments of Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Cambodia, Libya, and other states.

Just listing these countries is illustrative. They are in regions where, until recently, imperialism and its placemen held sway and ruled.

In his 31 January 1985 speech to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz deliberated at length on how long it takes to "grasp all the aspects of the complex and subtle process of historical changes which are taking place around us." Nonetheless, the chief of the U.S. foreign policy department declared, "we must adjust our way of thinking to the new realities" -- and he included the "disintegration of colonial empires" among them.

Even while these words were being spoken, Washington was engaging in crude interference in the internal affairs of states whose systems constitute precisely one such reality which the current policymakers on the banks of the Potomac refuse to recognize. What is more, they oppose it by force of arms.

This course is of late being described by its advocates as "new globalism." Essentially, there is very little that is new here. Encroachment on the sovereign rights and legitimate interests of other states and peoples remains encroachment, whatever label it is given. The overthow of lawful governments has long been the "globalists" business.

What is relatively new in this practice is that peoples threatened from outside have had increased chances of upholding their rights, while the aspirations of imperialist circles are running up against more serious obstacles than before.

Naturally, this is upsetting the latter more than just a little. They would like to convince gullible people in their own countries that the peoples in young independent states are allegedly not acting in accordance with their own will, but are "manipulated from the outside" by someone.

CIA Director W. Casey went as far as to declare that the developing countries will become an "arena of confrontation" between the USSR and the United States in the coming years. What countries in Asia, Africa, or Latin America have authorized the CIA chief to make such statements? You will not find any. Moreover, the governments of many of these countries have resolutely declared their reluctance to serve as such an "arena." The transatlantic "globalists" are trying to foist an unenviable fate on these countries. Under the banner of "anticommunism" they are working toward expanding their crude interference in the internal affairs of many countries on the aforementioned continents.

Addressing the U.S. Congress at the end of February 1985, Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger claimed that this course was dictated by Washington's desire for "forward-based defense," with a view to securing for the United States "bases and facilities which could be used for transferring forces" and for other operations on the Pentagon's "list."

Official Washington is still bemoaning the loss of its former bridgehead in southwest Asia provided by Iran under the shah. It cannot come to terms with the fact that Somoza, the U.S. minion, and his henchmen are no longer in power in Nicaragua. And the nostalgia for the times when there was a Portuguese empire in Africa is just as great. How, if not by this nostalgia for the past, is one to explain the U.S. Administration's attempts to increase its assistance to the mercenaries fighting against the lawful governments of Angola and Mozambique! The racists in the Republic of South Africa have enthusiastically welcomed this Washington "initiative."

Another aspect of this interventionist course must be mentioned. It is used by Washington to spike the wheels of the Geneva talks. It is claimed that our country's support for the cause of national liberation is incompatible with the search for accords in the disarmament sphere. While exacerbating the situation in certain parts of the world by dint of their imperial schemes and ambitions, the U.S. ruling circles are at the same time trying to depict the deteriorating situations in various regions -- for which they are to blame -- as an obstacle in the way of real disarmament.

Clearly having forgotten what he said in his 31 January 1985 speech, G. Shultz made considerable efforts during his latest trip to Western Europe to involve the U.S. allies in the interventionist course in a number of regions in Asia, Africa and Latin America. As always in such cases, NATO levers were used. At the NATO council session held 12-13 December this year the question of "events outside the treaty's sphere of operation" was again discussed. This is the label for Washington's strategy aimed at involving its allies in interventionist actions against regimes on the aforementioned continents which are not to the U.S. ruling circles' liking.

Once again no volunteers prepared to actively support this U.S. course could be found. It is causing opposition within the United States itself too. It is opposed not just by broad circles of the public, but also by a considerable number of individuals and groups within the U.S. bourgeoisie itself. Swimming against the realities of our time is not just a thankless exercise, it is also a risky business for the instigators of this course.

REAGAN, MADRID MEETING SHOWS U.S. REGIONAL PLANS

LD061754 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Leonid Levchenko commentary]

[Text] The Mexican President, Miguel de la Madrid met with his United States counterpart, Ronald Reagan, in the border city of Mexicali. Leonid Levchenko comments.

Mexico is the southern neighbor of the United States. As its president said, there is quite a number of difficult and delicate problems between the two countries. These problems concern not only bilateral relations. Some of them are regional and some even global. As it is, Washington has been displeased with Mexico's independent policy on the world scene for a long time. Mexico opposes its interference in the affairs of Central America, its crude pressure on Nicaragua. As a member of the Contadora Group, Mexico believes that regional problems should be resolved at the negotiating table on the basis of the peace act worked out with its active participation. At the United Nations and other forums, Mexico calls for fair economic relations between nations, for a solution to the pressing problems of debts owed by the developing countries to the West. Mexico is one of the countries whose own burden of debt is very heavy, 96 billion dollars, and to cover it the country is compelled to pay enormous sums which absorb virtually the whole of its national revenues.

On the threshold of the meeting between Miguel de la Madrid and Ronald Reagan, the Mexican press drew attention to the calls of the most reactionary circles in the United States for exerting stronger pressure on Mexico which is now experiencing a deep economic and financial crisis. The same tactics of pressure are used by Washington also against other developing countries to make them follow such policies externally and internally that would suit its own course.

According to analysts, during the meeting in Mexicali, President Reagan tried to exert pressure on his host to gain more understanding for United States policy towards Central America, but the Mexican president was adamant. His statement issued upon the conclusion of the talks pointed again to the necessity of reaching a settlement in Central America by peaceful means without outside interference on the basis of self-determination. Miguel de la Madrid called for resolving the problem of debts owed by the developing world on a fair bases. But his calls met with no understanding. Ronald Reagan recommended him to follow the so-called Baker plan. The plan stipulates that fresh loans to the debtors should be granted on condition of stringent economy and a favorable climate for the activity of transnational corporations which exploit and plunder the developing nations.

The meeting in Mexicali has proved that the United States does not wish to reckon with the interests of young nations, that it intends to kindle regional conflicts, to implant its own order there.

FORMER CIA OFFICER DETAILS PLOT TO KILL AL-NASIR

LD070959 Moscow TASS in English 0838 GMT 7 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 7 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatiyev reports: The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has a wide-ranging arsenal of sophisticated ways and means to assassinate foreign leaders and politicians that Washington happens to dislike.

This follows from the revelations made to the ROLLING STONE magazine by Miles Copeland, former chief of the C.I.A.'s Political Action Department who now heads a private firm in Britain, which specializes in security services.

He admitted that the U.S. congressional commission which had investigated the C.I.A.'s illicit masterminding of political assassinations in the 1970's had been allowed to learn only part of the truth.

The former C.I.A. agent said that after the failure of a tripartite aggression by Britain, France and Israel against Egypt in 1956 he had personally studied the possibility of physically removing President Al-Nasir and that he had done that on orders from the White House.

During a meeting with Al-Nasir Copeland was to distract the Egyptian president's attention and see if it was possible to drop a potassium cyanide tablet into his coffee without the other man's taking any notice.

The assassination expert also disclosed that a C.I.A. agent had once put a psychotropic drug into the shaving lotion used by Indonesian President Sukarno.

Copeland also spoke about how it was possible to use various poisons and toxins developed at Langley's laboratories to make a political assassination appear a natural death. He said all [as received] needed for that, for instance, was to give a requisite chemical treatment to a letter which was to be mailed to the selected victim. The poison would kill the target immediately once the envelope was opened and the letter taken in hand. Other available preparations could be used to cause the target to develop a fatal allergic raction to practically anything, including aspirin tablets and even tea.

PRIVATE U.S. GROUP PLANS 'RAID' IN INDOCHINA

LD062218 Moscow TASS in English 2146 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 6 TASS -- According to the newspaper WASHINGTON TIMES, members of the U.S. ultra-right-wing group "Private Delta Force" are now intensively training at a secret camp situated in Pennsylvania, near Breezewood, for a subversive raid of the territories of the sovereign country of South-east Asia. We shall penetrate Laos, Kampuchea or Vietnam to the depth of up to 50 kilometres, the head of the group who asked not to be identified said in an interview with the newspaper. He pointed out that it had been decided quite definitely that the raid would be staged, and that the only thing left was to choose a suitable time for its.

The newspaper reports that the U.S. authorities have long been aware of the provocative plans of the "Private Delta Force". However, they did not take any steps aimed at preventing their implementation. Moreover, the head of the group admitted that the group included not only retired U.S. servicemen, but also officers of the U.S. special force who are on active service.

JAPANESE-U.S. SDI ACCORD STEMS FROM TRADE TENSION

PM061209 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Agafonov "International Notes": "Preparing for the Storm"]

[Text] Against the backdrop of the major domestic political events which took place in Japan in the final days of last year (adoption of the government draft budget for the coming fiscal year and a cabinet reshuffle), the news that the first specific accord has been reached on the transfer of Japanese military technology to the United States has somehow passed unnoticed. Yet this is noteworthy in itself and deserves closer attention.

According to a report in the ASAHI EVENING NEWS, Japan has agreed to pass to the Pentagon ground-to-air missile homing technology developed at the technical research institute attached to the Japan defense agency. The documentation package including blueprints and calculations will be dispatched from Tokyo in the summer of this year.

The "first swallow" which heralds the start of Japanese-U.S. "cooperation" in the sphere of military technology transfer is by no means the biggest "catch" among Japanese development ventures which have attracted U.S. interest. As is known, the long list handed by the U.S. military department to Japanese colleagues specifies a wide range of products including integrated circuits for robots and manipulators, night vision instruments, fiber optics equipment, ultra-high-temperature resistant coatings, and laser technology equipment. Thus, the accord which has been achieved is only the start of a supermarathon whose final lap, figuratively speaking, vanishes over the horizon.

The U.S. generals' appetite in this case is understandable and is dictated by simple considerations -- namely, without having to invent the nuts and bolts, taking over their partner's achievements and launching them on the military-industrial complex production line with a minimum of expenditure; using Japan's scientific and technical potential as a kind of generator of advanced technologies; and keeping tabs on a dangerous rival and barring his breakthrough into that part of the U.S. market which is geared to military production.

What then does the Japanese side stand to gain from this "cooperation"? Clearly, the answer to this question must be sought in other spheres of Japanese-U.S. relations and primarily, in the sphere of trade and economic relations.

Contradictions between Washington and Tokyo in questions of trade have long since become proverbial and they were further markedly aggravated last year. The final figures on the U.S. trade deficit with Japan are expected in February, but the Japanese press is already predicting the force of the storm which they will unleash in the Unites States. The forcasts, to put it mildly, are gloomy. Tokyo is preparing well in advance for when the "storm" breaks. The first accord on military technology transfer reached a few days ago is one of the stages in the preparations to smooth over the situation.

N.KOREAN REPRESENTATIVES DECRY U.S.-KOREAN MANEUVERS

Parliamentary Delegation Head

OW062333 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1215 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From the "World Today" program presented by Bronislav Myakota]

[Text] Chon Kum-chol, head of the DPRK delegation to the preliminary parliamentary talks with South Korea, has demanded that the United States immediately withdraw U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea.

The presence of U.S. Armed Forces in the south of the Korean peninsula, he noted, leads to an exacerbation of tensions in this region and hinders the peaceful reunification of Korea. The head of the DPRK delegation called on the United States and Korea to refrain from holding military maneuvers this year similar to "Team Spirit-85." A provocative show of force of this kind aimed against the DPRK threatens the North-South dialogue and can lead to serious and irreversible consequences for the development of relations between the two sides, the statement says.

Red Cross, Military

PM061553 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS reports: "Urgent Appeal"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 4 Jan -- Yi Chong-yul, head of the DPRK Red Cross Society and minister of public health, has appealed today to the United States and South Korea to abandon holding joint military maneuvers like "Team Spirit-85" during talks with the South Korean Red Cross Society. Such a blatantly provocative demonstration of strength directed against the DPRK, he pointed out in a statement issued here, leads to worsening tension on the Korean peninsula and poses a threat to North-South dialogue. The statement stresses that the DPRK advocates the country's peaceful unification through negotiation.

Pyongyang, 4 Dec -- Major General Yi Tae-ho, senior DPRK member of the Military Armistice Commission in Korea, has called on the United States to give a positive response to the DPRK proposals that the holding of military maneuvers on the Korean peninsula be limited and that additional security measures be taken in the Panmunjom area, where the sessions of the commission and contacts between delegations of the North and South of the country take place. At the latest session of the Military Armistice Commission he stressed that achieving an accord and practical measures on these questions was very urgent not only with regard to continuing dialogue between the two countries, but in the interests of reducing tension on the Korean peninsula.

REAGAN, PAKISTAN PREMIER REMARKS ON AFGHANISTAN CRITICIZED

LD291742 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1428 GMT 29 Dec 85

["Who Is Hindering Normalization" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 29 Dec (TASS) -- TASS observer Valeriy Vavilov writes:

Speaking on radio in Los Angeles, U.S. President Ronald Reagan, crudely distorting the true state of affairs, once again tried to blame the Soviet Union for the situation that has built up over Afghanistan, claiming that the "presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan is the main obstacle in the way of improving mutual relations between the United States and the USSR."

At the same time, in another part of the globe -- Islamabad -- Pakistani Prime Minister Mohammad Khan Junejo claimed in parliament that the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan is the "main obstacle" in the way to normalizing Pakistani-Afghan relations. He once again rejected the holding of direct talks with the government of Babrak Karmal.

Both these statements sound so identical, even though they were made in places that are separated by tens of thousands of kilometers! This, of course, is no accident -- Islamabad has long served as a loyal tool in Washington's hands, obediently carrying out all the instructions of its boss from across the ocean.

To please Washington the Islamabad military regime has actively joined in the undeclared war against the people and the government of the DRA. By dealing in dollar handouts, Islamabad has placed its territory at the disposal of counterrevolutionary bands of dushmans, helping them to perpetrate bloody crimes in the neighboring country. On instructions from Washington regular Pakistani troops, supported by tanks, artillery, and aircraft, have unleashed a broad punitive operation against the freedom-loving Pushtun tribes, turning regions of traditional settlement into a death zone of "scorched earth," thus "freeing" main routes of pursuit for bands of the counterrevolutionary rabble in the DRA.

Dressing up in the toga of "champion of democracy," Islamabad refuses to positively consider the specific constructive proposals made by Kabul to the effect that authoritative representatives of the Afghan and Pakistani governments, by way of direct talks, elucidate and settle all questions, in whose solution the peoples of both countries have a deep interest.

On the contrary, whilst fitting in with the military and strategic interests of the Pentagon, Islamabad is stubbornly rejecting the idea of direct talks, despite the fact that the patriotically-minded Pakistani public organizations, and even many deputies in the parliament, are insistently demanding that direct contact with Kabul be established and that the confrontation thus be halted, that is, an end be put to the participation in the undeclared war against the DRA.

As for the actual "main obstacle," then it is to be found in a direction that is opposite to that to which Washington and Islamabad are pointing, for, as has been stressed frequently, the limited Soviet contingent situated in Afghanistan at the request of the DRA Government will be withdrawn from the country as soon as interference in the internal affairs of this sovereign state cease and it is guaranteed that it will not be resumed in the future. It is precisely the foreign interference in which Pakistan plays not the least significant role that is the main obstacle in the way to normalizing the situation surrounding Afghanistan.

DZASOKHOV-LED SOVIET DELEGATION ARRIVES IN KABUL

LD070016 Kabul Domestic Service in Pashto 1530 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] A high-ranking delegation headed by Aleksandr S. Dzasokhov, first deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With African and Asian Countries, arrived in Kabul today for a friendly visit at the invitation of the DRA Peace, Solidarity and Friendship Organization.

The delegation was welcomed at Kabul international airport by 'Abddol Majid Sarboland, Vice Chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers and deputy chairman of the Afghanistan Peace, Solidarity and Friendship Organization; Abdorrahim Hatif, chairman of the Central Council of the National fatherland front; and F.A. Tabeyev, Soviet ambassador in Kabul.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS END OF MARTIAL LAW IN PAKISTAN AS 'FARCE'

PM031110 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS reports under the general heading "Pakistan: From Dictators to 'Democrats'"]

[Text] Islamabad, 30 Dec -- At a joint session of both houses of the Pakistani parliament held here today president Ziaul Haq announced the lifting of the longest period of martial law in the country's entire history. After its lifting the 1973 constitution has been restored with amendments and changes, the military courts have been abolished, and the cases they are handling have been passed on to the civil courts.

President Ziaul Haq has retained the post of chief of staff of the ground forces and thereby continues to exert total control over the army.

The appointment of new governors of Pakistan's provinces has also been announced. N.A. Khan (Khoti) has been named governor of north-west frontier province; (G.S. Khusseyn Kureshi) governor of the Punjab; and General (retd) (Musa) Khan has been named governor of Baluchistan. Lieutenant (Dzhakhan Dad) Khan continues as governor of Sind Province.

Delhi, 30 Dec -- Local observers are assessing the lifting of martial law, that had been in operation in Pakistan for more than 8 years, as a farce aimed at attempting to wrap a pseudodemocratic cloak around the military regime's crimes against its own country and peace and security in the region.

On the other hand, observers are also noting that this farce was staged with Washington's knowledge and approval. The U.S. administration would thus like to avoid the charges that are being voiced increasingly vocally in the United States itself of supporting the military regime.

Preparations for today's show started some time ago. Using the votes of puppet deputies, the Ziaul Haq administration succeeded in pushing through the country's parliament -- which is itself the military dictatorship's creation -- a law which clears it of responsibility for all the crimes committed during the years of military rule.

It really needs that indulgence. As is well known, General Ziaul Haq came to power as a result of a bloody military coup in 1977. He immediately embarked on a harsh crackdown against his political opponents on the pretext of "imposing order." The country's legally elected prime minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, was put behind bars and subsequently executed. The same fate was shared by hundreds of Bhutto's associates in the Pakistan people's party. Thousands of opposition supporters who opposed the antipeople domestic and pro-U.S. foreign policy were put in prison torture chambers.

Nonetheless, today's decision demonstrated the rottenness of the military regime, which can no longer continue to rule the country by barrackroom methods and has been forced to maneuver. It was a consequence of the democratic opposition's persistent struggle against the military dictatorship. New mass demonstrations by opposition supporters demanding that the population be granted civil rights and freedoms, that political prisoners be released, and that elections be held on the basis of the 1973 constitution have been held in the country's three largest cities -- Lahore, Karachi, and Rawalpindi -- in the last week alone.

Moscow TV Commentary

LD062043 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kulagin]

[Text] In Karachi, Lahore, Rawalpindi and other towns in Pakistan there have been protest demonstrations by many thousands against the anti-popular policy of the ruling regime. The opposition parties of Pakistan, which have organized the demonstrations, are calling for the immediate holding of free elections in the country. They have called the statement by President Ziaul Haq on the lifting of martial law a deception. The head of the Islamabad regime announced that power in the country is being transferred to the civilian government of Prime Minister Mohammad Khan Junejo and that the constitution was being restored. In fact, however, nothing has changed in Pakistan. This was said by Tikka Khan, secretary general of the Pakistan People's Party, when speaking at a meeting in Rawalpindi. Martial law has only changed its appearance. Ziaul Haq has stayed in the posts of supreme commander in chief and president of the country. He, as before, enjoys the powers of a dictator. Any political activity is banned in the country; dissidents are threatened with repressive measures. In accordance on the law of political parties that has been adopted, each of them must apply to the authorities for official permission before resuming legal political activity. To judge by all appearances, this permission will only be given to those whose program satisfies official Islamabad.

So why did Ziaul Haq need the farce of lifting martial law at all? A number of observers note that this step was taken at the prompting of the Washington administration to facilitate the conclusion of more major military-economic deals with the United States. These are to be doubled in volume in comparison with those now in force, and will be worth $6.5 billion. Within the framework of this agreement the United States has promised to provide Islamabad with new military electronic technology which the Americans supply to far from all, even their close, allies. This is graphic demonstration of the special nature of relations between Islamabad and Washington. In exchange for the readiness of the Ziaul Haq regime to maintain the territory of its own country as a bridgehead for waging the undeclared war against Afghanistan, the Reagan administration is prepared to satisfy its militaristic ambitions. True, voices are to be heard in protest from time to time in the U.S. Congress against the provision of such immense aid to the repressive military dictatorship which uses them for the repression of its own people and to threaten neighbors.

The show of lifting martial law in Pakistan was thought up specifically to appease those critics.

MOSCOW TV NOTES U.S. CONCERN OVER PHILIPPINES

LD062242 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1953 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpts] A lively election campaign is continuing in the Philippines. The election campaign is tenacious and sometimes embittered in nature. There are meetings and demonstrations of thousands of people. As tension in the country intensifies, so interference in its affairs by the United States expands. Washington is seriously afraid that events in the Philippines could grow into a powerful popular uprising, as a result of which U.S. positions will be undermined.

More than anything else the Washington administration is worried over the fate of the two U.S. military bases, the largest outside U.S. borders. Their presence on Philippine soil arouses noisy protests in the country. Even some spokesmen of the bourgeois opposition state that they are against the maintenance of U.S. military installations after 1991, when the term of the agreement signed over them expires. These are the Subic Bay base, which is for the Navy, and Clark Air Force Base. The 13th U.S. Air Force was [as heard] based at Clark Field. Ships of the U.S. Seventh Fleet are based at Subic Bay. The U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK stressed that the United States will hold onto the bases in Philippines at almost any price. Otherwise, as the magazine opines, the balance of power in the Pacific Ocean will change.

The U.S. administration is sending to the Philippines one after the other of its high-ranking emissaries, trying to impose on Manila formulas for conducting domestic policy. Recently the latest group of Washington observers, who intend to monitor the election campaign, arrived there. When voting begins there will be more than 120 U.S. observers there. Naturally, this arouses dissatisfaction among Filipinos, who consider themselves capable of handling their own affairs without the aid of U.S. advisers. This is not just interference in our political life, but real intervention -- this was the conclusion reached by one of the leading newspapers in the country, the DAILY EXPRESS.

SRV FOREIGN MINISTRY CITED ON PARACEL, SPRATLY ISLANDS

LD062116 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] A representative of the SRV Ministry of foreign affairs has made a statement in Hanoi, in which it is said that the Paracel islands and the Spratly islands are a sacred and inseparable part of the territory of Vietnam.

TASS NOTES CAMBODIA'S SUCCESSFUL DEVELOPMENT

LD061423 Moscow TASS in English 1600 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow January 6 TASS -- TASS commentator Vasily Volin writes:

Kampuchea now meets guests with a broad smile. And in the recent past it was a devastated and lifeless land. January 7, 1979, the day of the country's deliverance from the Pol Pot tyranny, put Kampuchea on a difficult path of revival. The question was exactly the survival of the nation after 44 month-long rule of present-day inquisitors.

One can now see children playing and laughing on the ancient Angkor land, noisy bazaars functioning, there are new schools almost in every village. Phnom Penh with its higher educational establishments, libraries and museums has burst into blossom again. With the help of fraternal socialist countries the Kampuchean people are successfully rehabilitating the economy, having restored enterprises, transport and communications, having become in the main self-sufficient in food. Life in the country has returned to normalcy, which enabled it to get down as of this year to implementation of Kampuchea's first five-year plan -- the programme of socio-economic restoration and development of the country.

The Kampuchean people would have attained greater successes over these seven years, were it not for the unending interference on the part of imperialist and reactionary forces. In their struggle against the People's Republic of Kampuchea they stake on the self-same Pol Pot men -- butchers of three million Kampucheans. Terroristic groupings of Khmer reaction are trying, as before, to destablise the life in the Republic, to make the population turn away from people's power by promises and threats.

A serious strike was hit on designs of the enemies who receive American and other aid. In the past "dry season" the People's Revolutionary Army of Kampuchea, supported by the population and Vietnamese volunteers, smashed all Pol Pot subversive bases along the Kampuchean-Thai frontier. Bandits giving themselves up to the organs of people's power -- one by one and in whole units has become a wide spread phenomenon.

With ground slipping from under their feet, the enemies are manoeuvering. The main butcher, Pol Pot, is being put to the background: His resignation from the post of "commander in chief" was announced in August last year. His statement on the intention to cease any military and political activity has recently been circulated. That statement, it is true, has some strings attached, but one thing is indisputable: The initiators and proponents of the genocide policy are ready to sacrifice the most odious figure in their camp. Is it not the evidence of a moral, political and military defeat of enemies of the republic!

As to the presence of Vietnamese volunteers in Kampuchea, it is well-known that they threaten nobody -- neither Thailand nor the United States trumpeting louder of all in the West about "a Vietnamese threat." These contingents will be withdrawn when there disappears a threat to Kampuchea from outside and when the safety and tranquility of the Kampuchean people are ensured. People's Kampuchea demands full elimination of the whole of the Pol Pot clique from the political scene, as a compulsory condition.

The seven years of Kampuchea's successful development along the lines of the revival have proved that no difficulties and designs on the part of the enemies will be able to turn back the life of that country. The earnest of that are the firm will of the Kampuchean people, the fraternal support and assistance from the Soviet Union, Vietnam, other socialist countries.

BROVIKOV APPOINTED NEW AMBASSADOR TO POLAND

LD061836 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Vladimir Ignatiyevich Brovikov ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Polish People's Republic.

Aleksandr Nikiforovich Aksenov has been released from his duties as ambassador plenipotentiary and extraordinary to the PPR in connection with his transfer to other work.

Warsaw Report

LD061948 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1830 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Vladimir Brovikov ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Soviet Union to Poland.

Vladimir Brovikov was born in 1931. He is a candidate of philosophical sciences. For many years he was involved with journalistic and party work.

He has held important posts in the CPSU Central Committee apparatus: he was also second secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee. Since 1980 he has been chairman of the Belorussian SSR's Council of Ministers. He is a member of the CPSU Central Committee and a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

MORE ON ANTONOV VISIT TO POLAND

PM061233 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit by Delegation"]

[Text] Warsaw, 4 Dec -- W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of State, has received A.K. Antonov, head of a Soviet delegation visiting Poland and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Areas for further developing Soviet-Polish cooperation in line with decisions taken during coordination of plans between Poland and the USSR for 1986-1990 were positively evaluated during their conversation. W. Jaruzelski stressed that it was extremely important for Poland's socioeconomic development to implement the decisions.

A meeting was also held between the Soviet delegation leader and W. Gwiazda, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers. The Soviet delegation visited sites of the Warsaw subway -- an important project for the Polish capital that is being carried out thanks to Soviet cooperation.

GROWTH OF PARTY RANKS DISCUSSED AT PZPR PLENUM

PM070945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Unnamed own correspondent dispatch under the "Fraternal Parties" rubric: "Strengthening Ranks"]

[Text] Warsaw, 4 Jan -- The capital's PZPR organization has more than 127,000 members. Workers comprise 21.2 percent and young people under 30 3.7 percent. These figures were cited at a recent plenum of the Warsaw PZPR Committee devoted to strengthening the ranks of the capital's party organization.

Recently the process of reductions in the party ranks has essentially stopped. Each month the number of candidates accepted grows. In the period from last January through October, for example, there were 2,242 in Warsaw. However, as was noted at the plenum, these figures cannot be considered satisfactory. Ensuring further strengthening and growth of party ranks, especially the stratum of workers and young people, is deemed a very important area of work for the Warsaw party organization in the runup to the 10th PZPR Congress. At the same time attention was paid to enhancing the responsibility and role of every primary party organization in the life of labor collectives and in strengthening the ideological and political preparedness of PZPR members to resolve the pressing tasks of socialist building.

WESTERN BOYCOTT FAILS TO 'DESTABILIZE' POLAND

PM061940 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Bonds of Friendship and Cooperation"]

[Text] Warsaw, 2 Jan -- The attempts to impose a political boycott on Poland by Western countries over the last few years have suffered total failure. The plans to destabilize Poland's domestic situation and create economic difficulties inside the country have been thwarted, M. Orzechowski, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and Polish foreign minister, declared.

He noted in an interview with TRYBUNA LUDU that a consistent domestic policy and active foreign policy have enabled the Polish state to retake its proper position in the international arena. Firm bonds of friendship and cooperation link Poland with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. These relations of alliance have always been, are, and will be the cornerstone of Poland's foreign policy. They are based on common class and state interests and are the foundation of the Polish state's security and a condition of the successful implementation of the tasks of Poland's further development along the path of socialism. We have drawn the proper conclusions on the basis of experience in the last few years, primarily in Poland's economic relations with Western countries, M. Orzechowski indicated. Substantial changes have occurred in the structure of Poland's foreign economic relations, primarily in the directon of expanding cooperation with the fraternal states.

It is to be hoped, the minister stressed, that the process of the improvement of the international situation, which began with the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva, will be consolidated. Nevertheless, there can be no ignoring the fact that imperialism is implementing a policy of expanding the arms race and transferring it to outer space. An alternative to the imperialist policy of confrontation is provided by the active peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states, aimed at improving the international climate and curbing the arms race.

LIGACHEV MEETS WITH HUNGARY'S HORVATH 6 JAN

LD061723 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 6 TASS -- Today Yegor Ligachev, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Istvan Horvath, secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (HSWP), who is currently in Moscow together with a group of senior officials of the HSWP Central Committee at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

During a comradely conversation, there was an exchange of views on topical matters of the party guidance of the development of the political systems of socialist society, refinement of the style and methods of work of the party, local-government and state bodies. The Hungarian comrades were informed of the course of preparation for the 27th Congress of the CPSU. Satisfaction with the fruitful development of contacts between the CPSU and the HSWP and of Soviet-Hungarian relations based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism was expressed.

YAMBURG PIPELINE AGREEMENT SIGNED WITH HUNGARY

PM061419 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Developing Cooperation"]

[Text] In Moscow 30 December an agreement was signed between the USSR and Hungary on developing the Yamburg gasfield and constructing the Yamburg-Western border of the USSR main gas pipeline and oil and gas facilities in the Caspian depression.

The agreement promotes the practical fulfillment of the decisions taken in 1984 at the CEMA members' economic summit and the implementation of the provisions of the Long-term Program for Developing Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation Between the USSR and Hungary for the Period Through the Year 2000 and provides graphic evidence of the deepening of socialist economic integration. The Hungarian organizations' participation in the construction of the projects in question will help to provide the Hungarian national economy with long-term supplies of Soviet natural gas.

The agreement was signed for the Soviet side by B.I. Aristov, USSR foreign trade minister, and V.G. Chirskov, USSR minister of the construction of oil and gas industry enterprises. The agreement was signed for the Hungarian side by J. Marjai, deputy premier of the Hungarian Council of Ministers. A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and S. Rajnai, Hungarian ambassador to the USSR, were present at the signing.

SFRY ECONOMIC ILLS, BILATERAL TIES DETAILED

PM231015 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 49, Dec 85 pp 22-24

[B. Pishchik article: "A Country on the March"]

[Excerpt] I found the two cities I visited this time, Belgrade and Dubrovnik, largely different from what they had been 19 years ago. On the opposite bank of the Sava, beyond a group of impressive administrative buildings, a number of modern housing developments for the capital's working people had sprung up.

The Adriatic coast from Dubrovnik to Cavtat is crowded with modern sanatoriums and hotels designed to meet the most exacting requirements. A whole tourist industry has emerged there. The picturesque 700-km road stretching right across the country from the coast to the capital passes through cities that abound in new and architecturally beautiful districts. Leafing through Yugoslav papers one comes on the names of steel plants, light industry factories, mines and electric power stations which some years ago did not exist.

While pointing to their undeniable successes, no one I talked with in Yugoslavia made any secret of the serious problems facing the national economy. Most mentioned the need for economic stabilization and voiced their concern over such troubles as the deceleration of growth in production, exports and commodity turnover, increasing amounts of unsold goods, a great shortage of jobs, and a large foreign debt. Real personal incomes have been declining steadily over the past six years.

The long-term programme for economic stabilization and the anti-inflation programme were adopted some years ago as part of the attempt to find a way out of this situation. These documents provide for a more intensive effort at every workplace, a more rational utilization of production capacities and work time, the improvement of the system of labour stimulation and social planning, and the accelerated introduction of new scientific and engineering ideas into production.

When the country encountered serious difficulties, those who wished to discredit the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and undermine the unity of Yugoslavia's peoples, were heartened. What Vidoje Zarkovic, president of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee, recently called the "ideological market" is making itself felt. More specifically, increased attempts are being made to play down the importance of the national liberation struggle and equate the conflicting ideological trends which have bedeviled the country's history.

Dragoljub Vujca, a veteran partisan and diplomat of many year's standing, referred to an article written by the Executive Secretary of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee Stanislav Stojanovic on the fortieth anniversary of Victory, in a recent issue of the journal SOCIALIST THOUGHT AND PRACTICE.

Today, Comrade Stojanovic writes, we must look back to the period in which the fascist powers were defeated lest we forget the bleak prospects fascism had in store for mankind and the sacrifices the freedom-loving nations had to make to save civilization. That memory must be kept fresh because the danger remains of another world war which threatens the very existence of the human race.

Long before the Second World War broke out, Yugoslav communists warned of the imminent danger of fascist aggression. And after the Kingdom of Yugoslavia suffered defeat in the short war of April 1941, the nation was prepared to carry on the fight against the invaders and did not tolerate occupation. Even when the country was divided by foreign conquerors, the communists kept their organization going as a national political force. There were then only 8,000 communists and 30,000 members of the Young Communist League. But they expressed the patriotic and anti-fascist feeling of the people, and most of society recognized the leading role they played in the fight for national and social liberation.

Stanislav Stojanovic reminds his readers that Germany's attack on the Soviet Union caused substantial changes in the international military-political situation. "The Soviet Union," he writes, "bore the brunt of the war thus creating objective prerequisites for the development of successful armed liberation struggles in other enslaved European countries. This had an enormous moral and political effect on the peoples of Yugoslavia."

Soviet Army was grinding Hitler's hordes at Stalingrad, the People's Liberation Army and the partisans liberated an area larger than Belgium in the heart of Yugoslavia. The truth about the Yugoslav struggle for national liberation was promulgated worldwide, largely thanks to the Free Yugoslavia radio station, which had been broadcasting from the Soviet Union since November 1941.

Massive resistance to the occupiers facilitated revolutionary reforms in society. On November 29, 1943, the Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia had its second session in Jajce, which amounted in effect to a revolutionary change of government. Exactly two years later, on November 29, 1945, Yugoslavia was proclaimed a federal republic.

Recalling the truth about the people's liberation struggle and the socialist revolution, the role of the communists and the importance of cooperation with the Soviet Union in those years, Stanislav Stojanovic writes: "The fact that in the course of the Second World War the peoples of Yugoslavia were the first to join hands with the peoples of the Soviet Union in the fight against the common enemy was of historic importance for us as a source of inspiration, as well as being a point of departure in promoting successful equal cooperation and friendship between our two nations in time of peace."

As I was leaving Moscow, Gorkiy Street and other avenues were bedecked with streamers announcing Belgrade Days. Concert programmes featured the best singers and musicians from the Yugoslav capital. A delegation from the Assembly of Croatia was completing its tour of the Soviet Union.

I shared my railway compartment with Aleksandr Biryukov, a ship's electrical engineer from Nakhodka. His colleagues and he were going to Split to inspect a new tanker, Kapitan Yershov, built to a Soviet order. In the next compartment, two research workers from the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Railways pored over their notes in preparation for a project they were to collaborate on with Yugoslav railwaymen.

In Belgrade we were greeted, almost right on the square in front of the railway station, by a poster announcing a new production of Verdi's Aida at the Belgrade Opera with Vladislav Pyavko, a Bolshoy theatre soloist, singing the leading role. The queue in front of the building where treasures from the Moscow Kremlin were being exhibited looked endless.

These are only small fragments in the Mosaic of cooperation between our two countries. All the statesmen and economic managers I met stressed the importance currently attached in Yugoslavia to economic, technical and cultural ties with the Soviet Union.

"The Soviet Union is our chief partner," Zivorad Kovacevic, member of the Federal Executive Council and Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, told me. "Your country's share in our foreign trade turnover amounts to 27 per cent as against a total of 44 per cent for the CEMA countries' overall -- a huge increase on the figure of 20 years ago. We do not confine ourselves to trade but pay a great deal of attention to co-production as well. The contacts between Yugoslavia's Crvena Zastava and Utva motor works, on the one hand, and VAZ and KAMAZ in the Soviet Union, on the other, are cases in point."

The results," Zivorad Kovacevic said in reply to my question, "are more stable technical cooperation, quantity production of components and assemblies, higher labour productivity and the appropriate reduction in production costs."

The results of our economic cooperation with Yugoslavia in the expiring five-year-plan period were also summed up at the Soviet trade mission. "In the course of the last five years," Leonid Stolyarov, head of the mission, told me, "we have done $35 billion worth of trade as against the $32 billion originally planned. Soviet deliveries of fuel, raw and other materials are of great importance for the Yugoslav national economy. We have now been selling electric energy to Yugoslavia for two years. We do a lot of buying as well -- some 30 percent of Yugoslavia's exports go to the U.S.S.R. All the major shipyards in Yugoslavia are busy fulfilling Soviet orders."

Our trade representative spoke highly of the record of joint production in car manufacturing and added that this practice had been extended to the building of walking excavators. Yugoslav factories produce vital components for these high-powered Soviet machines which are doing efficient work in the open-case mines of Tuzla, Kostolac and Pljevlja. Yugoslav miners have every praise for Soviet tunnelling machines, drillings rigs and well pumps.

"We have our problems, of course, "Leonid Stolyarov admitted. "Delivery schedules are not always observed, the quality of the product isn't always up to the mark, and not all the reserves are made full use of. However, these are current problems which our Yugoslav colleagues and we solve by joint effort."

The republics and provinces of Yugoslavia have an active role to play in maintaining the country's foreign scientific, educational and cultural contacts. These contacts are coordinated on behalf of the national government by the Federal Administration for International Scientific, Technical and Cultural Cooperation of which Milenko Zrelec is director.

Recently the administration and the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology signed an agreement on cooperation for the period of up to the year 2000. The document provides for joint research in such priority fields as electronics, microprocessor technology, robotics, new energy sources and biotechnology.

"Useful and mutually beneficial work is under way," Comrade Zrelec says. "The meetings between Milka Planinc, our head of government, and Mikhail Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders in Moscow last summer gave it a new impulse."

"A red-letter day is always an occasion both for looking back over the years and glimpsing into the future. The fortieth anniversary of the republic is no exception.

"This jubilee," Aleksandar Grlickov, president of the Federal Conference of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, told me, "is a special one in that we celebrate it in the year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany. The political slogans of this jubilee year mobilize the nation to work to resolve strategic development problems. The task now is to cope with economic difficulties, and step up the nation's effort towards economic stability. This is the background against which we are preparing the elections at all levels, from local to federal, and of course for the 13th Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. We have to work out ways of solving the problems confronting us today, and outline prospects for the further development of our country and its political life."

Dwelling on the significance of these efforts, Comrade Grlickov pointed out that it was part of the overall endeavour to strengthen party unity and the unity of the peoples of Yugoslavia, and promote self-government. This process has another aspect to it: as the older generation who were directly involved in the struggle for national liberation leave the scene, young people are stepping in and becoming increasingly active. The leaders of the country are seeking to secure a majority for the workers at all levels of party development and in all other spheres of public life. They also consider it important to have more non-party men in the parliaments, in the Socialist Alliance of the Working People and in the trade unions. All this will make for still closer links between the party and the people.

"We attach great importance to the work for party unity," Grlickov went on, "Because unity is the key to the problems the party is struggling with today. The all-party discussion we held has revealed different views on ways of solving these problems. But now is the time to take stock, to act instead of merely talking. Such action presupposes unity."

"Does this apply to the consolidation of national unity as well?"

"Certainly," Grlickov replied. "Considering that our republics differ in standards of development and that their interests do not always coincide, we provide for different ways of coping with our problems. The solution to some of the more acute problems facing our economic system is entirely dependent on the unity of our peoples. For instance, we need new laws on currency and banking, and on aid to the less developed republics from the developed ones. We have to achieve greater coordination lest differences of opinion amongst the republics and autonomous provinces impede the solution of political and economic problems and the passing of new laws. Unfortunately, such impediments do exist and have extremely adverse effects."

Yugoslavia is on the march. Its friends wish it every success in overcoming the obstacles it encounters on its way.

MITTERRAND CONFIRMS VISIT TO USSR 'THIS YEAR'

LD062208 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2133 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Paris, Jan 6 (TANJUG) -- French President Francois Mitterand confirmed this evening that he will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union this year at the invitation of General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Mikhail Gorbachev. Mitterrand will thus return the visit to Gorbachev who was in France last October.

The possibility of a meeting between Gorbachev and Mitterrand in Moscow this year was mentioned for the first time during a recent visit of a French parliamentary delegation to the Soviet Union. Official Soviet sources indicated at the time that the Soviet-French meeting would certainly take place before the next Reagan-Gorbachev meeting.

GROWTH OF NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES IN UK EXAMINED

LD070007 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From the "Vantage Point" with commentary by Boris Belitskiy]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev's reply last week to a message from Ken Livingston, the leader of the Greater London Council [GLC], has stimulated interest both here in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in the movement in Britain for the establishment of nuclear-free zones. This is the subject discussed in "Vantage Point" by Boris Belitskiy today:

Last month Ken Livingstone the GLC leader elected by the majority party, Labor, wrote to Mikhail Gorbachev outlining the views of British supporters of nuclear-free zones and the aims of the movement, stressing the need for progress in international disarmament talks and welcoming Soviet initiatives in this area. In his reply, Mikhail Gorbachev expressed full understanding of the concern felt by people in Britain over the dangerous developments in the world and reaffirmed Soviet resolve to work for radical reductions in nuclear arms and for keeping weapons out of space. He also welcomed the movement of municipal councils and other organizations to establish nuclear-free zones. Such zones, he feels, are not wishful thinking, not idealistic dreams but a positive development in international affairs expressing the peoples' will for peace, cooperation, and international relaxation. And the Soviet leader stated that if Britain were to renounce nuclear weapons and remove foreign nuclear bases from her territory the USSR would guarantee that no Soviet nuclear weapons were targetted on British territory or ever used against Britain. Such guarantees could, moreover, be formalized in an official agreement, taking into account all the military aspects of the matter.

The Soviet leader's message of reply to the GLC head has naturally aroused much interest among people in this country, and not only in this country, in this new form of antiwar activity, which has been spreading in Britain. In reply to many questions I, for one, have been explaining to people here that back in November 1980, Manchester gave birth to this movement by proclaiming itself a nuclear-free zone. By the spring of 1984, as many as 170 municipal councils in Britain had taken similar decisions, the GLC among them. Its decision forbids the deployment in, or transportation through, Greater London of any types of nuclear weapons or radioactive material. Following the example of so many urban areas, whole areas in various parts of the United Kingdom have likewise delcared themselves nuclear-free zones. It's estimated that the population of these zones exceeds 50 million people [figure as heard], more than half the people of Britain.

The strength of Britain's antiwar movement was demonstrated to the world once again last month over 25,000 women from all over the country linked arms at Greenham Common, turning their backs, as they put it, on the military lunacy inside the base to mark the 6th anniversary of the NATO decision to deploy nuclear missiles in Western Europe. During these entirely peaceful protests, in the course of which the women decorated the 9-mile perimeter fence around the base with what they called tokens of life in the form of beautifully embroidered banners and flowers, a United States water cannon vehicle was spotted and filmed as it was rolled out for exercise.

Earlier, it has been strenuously denied that any such equipment for use against the people of Britain was stationed at this or other American bases. There was something ominously symbolic, many people felt, in this show of American strength against British demonstrators as the United States keeps increasing its military presence in the country. And such concern, it seems to me, it is well justified.

CHERNYSHEV COMMENTS ON NATO PRESSURE ON SPAIN

PM0615[illegible] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladimir Chernyshev "Commentator's Column": "Pressuring Spain"]

[Text] Madrid -- Is there, do you think, anything unusual about the visit to Madrid by NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington? After all, since 30 May 1982 Spain has officially been the 16th member of the North Atlantic bloc, although not part of its military structure. But Carrington arrived, at an acute moment. The fact is that the present Spanish Government, headed by F. Gonzalez, leader of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, came to power in December 1982, largely thanks to its sharp criticism of the country's involvement in the aggressive bloc. Furthermore, a promise was given to hold a national referendum on the question of participation in the pact's military structure.

In the past 4 years since then the pressure on Spain from the NATO members headed by the United States has not abated but, on the contrary, has actually intensified. In the opinion of many commentators Spain was only accepted into the Common Market after long tribulations in the clear hope of thus fettering the country even more firmly with "Atlantic solidarity."

Influenced by this pressure, Gonzalez changed his stance. Now he supports Spain's full integration in NATO. People here are drawing attention to the fact that Carrington arrived in Madrid shortly before the opening of the debates on defense and national security questions in the Spanish Parliament's Congress of Deputies during which the head of the government is to announce the date of the referendum and make public the formulation of the question which will be put to a vote.

It is the referendum, the newspaper EL PAIS notes, which causes most worry to Carrington as it does to the governments of the majority of NATO countries. "The NATO secretary is trying to persuade Gonzalez not to hold the referendum" was the headline under which Madrid's DIARIO 16 reported the visit.

The NATO leadership fears among other things, that the vote in Spain may prove a "bad" precedent for other countries in this bloc whose peoples may also demand that the question of participation in NATO be offered for general discussion.

The overt pressure on Spain has aroused indignation from its public. On the appeal of the anti-NATO countries and the national coordinating committee of Spain's pacifist organizations, a protest demonstration was organized near the Foreign Ministry building. "No to NATO, U.S. Bases Out!" and "We will win the Referendum!" the demonstrators chanted. The trade union confederation of worker's commissions stated that the NATO secretary general's visit is "flagrant interference" in the campaign mounted in the country in connection with the approaching referendum. The Spanish Communist Party has noted that this visit is aimed at trying to change public opinion in Spain, which rejects feelings held everywhere here.

BONN CONTINUES 'HOSTILE CAMPAIGN' AGAINST DRA

LD041128 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 3 Jan 86

[Vladimir Fadeyev commentary]

[Text] As the Afghan news agency BAKHTAR has reported, official Bonn has given another DM2 million in the form of material support to the dushmans through Pakistan. I will note that the latest financial contribution to the dushman purse has been made by the jealous supporters of freedom and democracy in Bonn under a hypocritical claim about the sufferings of the Afghans. The hostile campaign toward democratic Afghanistan has been continuing in the FRG over the last few months. It was quite recently that one of the ringleaders of the Afghan counterrevolution, (Golboddin Hekhmatyar), having exchanged a turban and robe for a European suit, posed willingly in front of hundreds of cameras and journalists as an honored guest of the FRG.

The trip of this arrant bandit and murderer to the banks of the Rhine as a representative of the so-called army of freedom fighters in Afghanistan was a success, as we see. With the money received from FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl a new batch of U.S. ground-to-air missiles will be purchased, the very same with which the passenger plane was shot down in Qandahar region. They will spend it on explosives for terrorist acts the likes of which were carried out recently in Kabul airport and in the building of the Kabul Polytechnical Institute, and on automatic weapons and machine guns with which peasants will be shot. With this money they will buy boobytrap bombs which will explode in the hands of Afghan children.

The official speeches by Bonn leaders when they are trying to mislead the public of their country, distorting the actual state of events in democratic Afghanistan, do not mention such aiding and abetting of the dushmans. And indeed, what objective assessment of the situation in this country can be expected from the official representatives in Bonn? The matter has gone so far that with their blessing one of the Bundestag deputies from the CDU,[Christian Democratic Union] Juergen Todenhoefer, has secretly penetrated into Afghanistan with the dushmans from Pakistan three times already, filmed the dushman raids and then passed it all off in his country as a struggle by Afghan champions of faith -- as it is accustomed to call the dushmans in the West -- against government troops. Now Todenhoefer has started so-called preparatory courses in the FRG on matters relating to propaganda, at which 60 ringleaders of the dushman bands are being taught subversive activity. On the basis of everything that has been said one can say with complete justification that we are talking about the direct involvement of the Bonn government in the undeclared war against the Afghan people, and it is quite impossible to assess such a policy in any other light.

PLO'S QADDUMI MEETS POLYAKOV IN MOSCOW

AU061447 Paris AFP in English 0922 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, Jan 6 (AFP) -- Faruq Qaddumi, the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) political department chief, has met Soviet officials here during an unannounced visit which began on Saturday, diplomatic sources said today.

Talks were thought to have covered the December 27 Rome and Vienna airport attacks, and the problem of unity among Palestinian groups, but not a possible visit by PLO chairman Yasir 'Arafat which had recently been hinted at.

Mr. Qaddumi had met the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Middle East Section Chief, Vladimir Polyakov, and was due to meet the corresponding official on the Party's Central Committee, Karen Brutents.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON U.S.-LIBYAN TENSIONS

'State of War'

LD061232 Moscow TASS in English 1224 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Tripoli, January 6 TASS -- The United States has conceived a highly dangerous game by concentrating close to 40 warships in the Mediterranean off the Libyan shores, Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, told U.S. journalists.

This cannot be assessed otherwise than the state of war. The Libyan people will defend its homeland with all means at their disposal, M. al-Qadhdhafi said.

The United States, he furthermore said, aids and abets Israel and commits under the pretext of "combatting terrorism" crimes against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples. Washington bears the responsibility also for Israelis' crimes against Lebanon, Syria, Egypt and other countries, since U.S. weapons are used to perpetrate them.

The U.S. Administration prefers to keep silent on the murder by Zionists of women, old men and children in the Sabra and Shatila camps, on the Libyan commercial aircraft, whose shooting down by Israelis in 1973 claimed loss of life. What is committed today against Libya, the Palestine people and the entire Arab nation is none other than terrorism, M. al-Qadhdhafi said.

Banghazi, Ajdabiyah, Sabratah, other towns and settlements of the Libyan Jamahiriyah have become anew the scene of massive demonstrations to protest an armed aggression in preparation by the United States and Israel against the Libyan people. The protesters carried posters and vigorously condemned the interventionist plans of Washington and Tel Aviv.

Target List Prepared

LD061917 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program: video report presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] The U.S. Administration continues whipping up its anti-Libyan campaign.

Washington has once again decided to resort to gunboat diplomacy, or more precisely, aircraft carrier diplomacy. The United States is making use of precisely these naval giants, which are the objects of particular pride among American military strategists, for its expansion in various parts of the globe. The aircraft carrier "Coral Sea," which has left Naples, is now on its way toward the Libyan coast. It carries four squadrons of F-18 fighter-bombers. It is escorted by two cruisers and four other naval vessels. Another aircraft carrier, the America, and the battleship Iowa -- which at the moment are in the port of Norfolk on the U.S. East coast -- await the order to cross the Atlantic and join the U.S. armada in the Mediterranean.

The Pentagon strategists have worked out several options for military operations directed against Libya, from support for an Israeli attack on that country to bombing individual targets on Libyan territory. Thus, it has become known that a list of targets for possible raids has already been prepared. Squadrons of the most up-to-date aircraft at the NATO base at Sigonella, Sicily have been put on combat alert to carry out the raids. Specialists are noting that U.S. aircraft based in Great Britain could also be used for raids. [Video shows clips of U.S. aircraft carrier, with caption in English "Norfolk, Virginia" on one, of combat aircraft in the air, on deck and at air base.]

The pretext for all this war hysteria was the tragic events which took place at the airports in Rome and Vienna. We recall that a group of terrorists there attacked peaceful passengers. These criminal acts have been condemned virtually worldwide; the Italian and Austrian authorities are now investigating, trying to find the culprits. However, Washington and Tel Aviv have no intention of waiting for the objective results of the inquiry. There they immediately tried to make use of the tragic incidents for their own selfish aims, as a pretext for aggression against Libya. The United States has no specific evidence at all of Tripoli's involvement in the incidents that have happened. Moreover, the Libyan Government has officially condemned the terrorist acts that were committed. This was done both at the UN and at a session of the Arab League. Nevertheless, there is no stopping Washington.

U.S. Reveals Motives

LD061905 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] A spokesman for the State Department, trying to justify U.S. military preparations against Libya, has said that it is not just a matter of the terrorist acts which took place at Rome and Vienna airports, but generally of long-term problems which are created for the United States by the Al-Qadhdhafi government. So although unwittingly, the American spokesman has given away the true motive for Washington's conduct. The United States does not like the anti-imperialist course which Libya pursues, nor its struggle against the schemes of the United States and Israel in the Near East and the Mediterranean.

Lomeyko Press Conference

LD061558 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 6 TASS -- The situation that has now developed around Libya and Syria is a concrete example of the United States' policy of "new globalism", emphasised Vladimir Lomeyko, the head of the Press Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, when answering journalists' questions at today's briefing at the ministry's press centre.

The policy ignores all norms of international law. The Ministry's spokesman recalled in this connection dozens of statements by U.S. officials that the United States was planning open punitive measures against Libya. The pretext is known to everyone: the terrorist acts in Rome and in Vienna. Despite the fact that the government of Libya has stated and is stating its non-involvement in those acts, official statements are being made in the United States about the need to "punish" Libya militarily.

They in Washington now talk not about how to settle a conflict between Libya and the USA, if that conflict exists, but about how to use means of warfare against Libya more effectively. Large naval units are now concentrated by the USA off the Libyan coast for the purpose.

It was noted at the briefing that the role of U.S. naval bases that are transshipment points for the transportation of U.S. forces into areas of conflicts, increases when such conflict situations arise.

Touching upon the developments in the Middle East, Vladimir Lomeyko also condemned resolutely Washington's and Tel Aviv's threats against Syria. He stressed that defensive measures of the Syrian Government taken by it in the framework of national territorial borders are implemented fully in keeping with its sovereign right to ensure its security.

Answering the question about what would be a stand of the USSR in case of the outbreak of an armed conflict between Libya and the USA, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry stressed that the Soviet Union's actions are aimed at preventing conflicts, not at constructing "scenarios" of its actions for their escalation. We condemn force and threat of force against Libya and Syria, we condemn war hysteria which is being whipped up around those countries, all attempts to unleash military or any other violent actions against sovereign states. We are for the resolution of regional conflicts in a peaceful way.

The question of the reprisals of Pakistan's military regime against free Pushtuns tribes was also touched upon at the briefing. Outright military operations against Pushtuns have been conducted for several weeks now, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said. This is an example of the policy of genocide against a whole people. This means destruction or attempts at destruction of tribes numbering over 700 thousand people. The Pushtun tragedy is a vivid example of how some countries treat the human rights problem. The Western mass media pass this matter in silence. When a problem does not fit in with a political line of the biggest information monopolies, then it is not reflected either by the press or by the television.

The United States aggressive actions against the lawful governments of Angola and Nicaragua were pointed out at the briefing as other vivid examples of "new globalism" policy in Washington's foreign policy activity.

'Retaliatory Measures' Contemplated

LD061811 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 6 TASS -- Today President Reagan calls a special meeting on foreign-policy and military matters. A White House spokesman has declined to announce a concrete agenda of the meeting. However, as informed observers point out, it will be again a question of "retaliatory measures" which the United States intends to take with regard to sovereign Libya, accusing it of support for "terrorists."

The spokesman made it clear that Washington is now seeking most actively to compel America's allies to go to an "economic isolation" of Libya. According to the spokesman, the United States will consult with the allies in this connection. It is significant that the spokesman declined to rule out a probability of military actions against the Libyan state.

U.S. 'Ready' To Strike

LD062007 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1802 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Political observer Boris Shabayev commentary; all quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jan (TASS) -- It is reported from Washington that Israel, which "would like it very much if the United States were to strike a blow against Libya, is casting glances on the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean Sea." From the aircraft carrier "Coral Sea," however, which is part of this fleet, "they are casting glances" at Libya already, it is apparent from the very same source. "It is quite clear -- the ABC Pentagon correspondent sums up -- that the U.S. war machine is ready to strike a blow." It is only a matter of the appropriate command.

A regular anti-Libyan hysteria has been unleashed in the United States by way of psychological preparation for the launching of such a strike. The notorious "fight against terrorism," which this Arab country is supposedly connected with, has again been chosen as the grounds for this, without further ado. Robert McFarlane, former presidential national security adviser, is demanding that "the military card be played" against Libya. Richard Lugar, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is even blunter and goes even further in his utterances, speaking of support "for the President's idea of toppling al-Qadhdhafi."

So what is happening then? It turns out that any foreign government which suddenly becomes not to Washington's liking, or as McFarlane put it, "tries the patience of the United States," may be simply overthrown, by force if necessary. It turns out that the norms of international law and inter-state relations inherent in our enlightened age are cynically being replaced by "the law of the jungle" across the ocean.

It is precisely by this "law" that the United States was guided in organizing, directing and financing the overthrow of the democratically elected lawful government of Chile in 1973. Ten years later the world once more witnessed its use on Grenada, which also "tried the patience" of Washington. The same U.S. Sixth Fleet, with guns and combat aircraft now trained on Libya, we have already seen off the Lebanese coast, where Washington and Israel, its strategic ally, attempted by fire and sword to bring in a puppet regime to their liking.

Judging by certain reports, those U.S. Administration figures who have not lost their sense of reality are warning that a joint U.S.-Israeli military operation against Libya will be considered anti-Arab and not at all as an operation against "terrorists." It would be no bad thing for the Washington "hawks" to heed these sober voices and restrain their bellicose ardor.

Israeli Planes on U.S. Carrier

LD070700 Moscow TASS in English 0652 GMT 7 Jan 86

[Text] Tripoli, January 7 TASS -- An Israeli plane squadron has been moved to an American aircraft-carrier based in the Mediterranean, Radio Tripoli reported.

And a squadron of U.S. radar jamming prowler aircraft were flown to the Sigonella base on Sicily.

Thus, the broadcast said, the United States and Israel concluded their preparations for an act of aggression against sovereign Libya.

Italy Denies Report

LD061805 Moscow TASS in English 1751 GMT 6 Jan 85

[Text] Moscow, January 6 TASS -- TASS commentator Lev Yuryev writes:

According to the Italian press, Italy's Defence Ministry denied a TASS report that a squadron of EA-6B electronic reconnaissance aircraft of the U.S. Airforce had been brought to the Sigonella military base in Sicily.

The TASS report was about the anti-Libyan campaign being whipped up of late by the United States and Israel and about Washington's and Tel Aviv's concrete military steps for the preparations of an armed intervention against that Arab country. The TASS report was based on reports of the Western mass media. For instance, with a reference to U.S. sources, TASS reported that the "Coral Sea" aircraft carrier had been sent to the Libyan coast and, accompanied by escort ships, was sailing in the Mediterranean.

According to the information of the A.B.C. television network, electronic reconnaissance aircraft were secretly taken to Sicily from the Washington state of the USA and that the aircraft was placed at the disposal of the commander of the naval unit whose flagship the "Coral Sea" aircraft carrier is. It is precisely this concrete report that evoked annoyance in Rome.

It is strange that the Italian Ministry of Defence reacted not to an original A.B.C. report on the secret sending of U.S. war planes to Italy (true, it was meant for Americans, and not for Italians) but to the TASS report that has made wide circles of the Italian public aware of the fact.

Taking into account Rome's denial, we would like to emphasize that we took seriously the A.B.C. information for we have long been aware how brazenly and easily Washington flouts national independence and sovereignty of its "junior partners" viewing them above all as a ready tool of its imperial policy, and their territory as a convenient place d'armes for preparing and unleashing military ventures to protect its so-called "vital interests".

The recent events around the apprehension of the Italian liner "Achille Lauro" showed convincingly enough to the Italians and the whole world that the U.S. military has got accustomed to holding sway in Italy's skies and on its land.

Peace Supporters 'Concerned'

LD061745 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1630 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] The Soviet Peace Committee has issued a statement saying that Soviet peace supporters received news of the U.S. and Israeli threats against Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah with deep anxiety.

American imperialism and Israeli ruling quarters, in order to achieve the goals of their aggressive policies, are preparing to commit a new, bloody crime under the arrogant pretext of combating terrorism; the excuse being used for this is the fabricated Libyan participation in the two terrorist actions at the Vienna and Rome airports.

It was revealed that the Pentagon has actually drawn up a list of the targets which it will bomb in the Libyan Jamahiriyah, and that the U.S. and NATO Navy and Armed Forces in the Mediterranean have been put on alert.

It also is ominous that the bourgeois newspapers are launching a campaign against Libya and are preparing international public opinion for the idea that aggression against Libya is part of combating terrorism, therefore it is a natural thing.

The Soviet peace supporters are gravely concerned about the situation around Libya and are strongly condemning the U.S. and Israeli actions which are violating the independence, sovereignty and dignity of the Libyan people; the peace supporters are calling for an immediate halt to preparations for aggression against Libya.

During these difficult times for the Libyan people, the Soviet peace supporters express their solidarity with the peace-loving Libyan people.

Soviet TU's Statement

LD070019 Moscow TASS in English 2005 GMT 6 Jan 86

["Aggression Must Be Prevented" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 6 TASS -- The USSR All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions has made a statement in connection with the situation that has formed around Libya. The friendly people of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah have come under the sinister threat of a treacherous imperialist aggression, the statement says. The U.S. imperialist circles and Israeli Zionists have launched a massive campaign of slander against that country under the invented pretext of Libya's alleged complicity in the recent acts of terrorism in Vienna and Rome. Despite the fact that the official Libyan authorities emphatically refuted this provocative accusation, the U.S. and Israel continue to whip up the anti-Libyan hysteria and urge to severely deal with that sovereign Arab country.

The mass media reports that the U.S. and Israeli military are stepping up war preparations, that the U.S. fleet is being concentrated close to Libya's territorial waters, that U.S. and NATO air force bases in the Mediterranean have been placed on combat alert.

The intrigues of the imperialist forces, their openly militaristic designs threaten to create in that part of the world a new dangerous seat of international tension which would jeopardize peace and security of nations, the statement stress.

On behalf of 137 million Soviet working people -- members of trade unions, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions expresses serious concern over the aggression which is being prepared against the Libyan Jamahiriyah, voices a resolute protest against the all-out provocative campaign launched against that country and urges the international working class and the world labour movement to disrupt the criminal plans of militarists and provocateurs, to put an end to the hostile encroachments of U.S. imperialism and Zionism on the sovereignty and independence of the Libyan people.

Canada Rejects Sanctions

LD071102 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 7 Jan 86

[Text] Ottawa, January 7 TASS -- Canada does not support the U.S. Administration's call for economic sanctions against Libya. A representative of the Foreign Ministry has stated that Canada's Government will not join economic sanctions against Libya.

The total Canadian-Libyan trade in 1984 amounted to 90 million dollars. About 1,300 Canadian citizens are now working in Libya under contracts. They are mainly engaged in the oil industry.

Maltese Oppose Operations

LD061842 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] The Government of Malta has expressed serious concern in connection with the extraordinarily exacerbated situation in the Mediterranean. Maltese Prime Minister Carmelo Mifsud Bounnicci has stated that his country is resolutely against any armed operations with regard to Libya. It is a duty of the European states, noted the prime minister, to exert pressure on the U.S. Administration, so as to convince it to give up the sinister idea of an armed aggression which will undermine security throughout the world.

Al-JUMAYYIL STRESSES NEED FOR ISRAELI WITHDRAWAL

LD061741 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Beirut, January 6 TASS -- President Amin al-Jumayyil of Lebanon, addressing the heads of diplomatic missions accredited in Lebanon, stated today that Israel should heed the voice of reason and, in compliance with the will of the international community, withdraw its troops from southern Lebanon so that the country could regain integrity and peace.

The Lebanese state, he emphasized, is unable to spread its sovereignty over to the entire territory of the country because southern areas are occupied by Israel and their population is constantly subjected to blackmail and acts of violence.

LEBANON DEMANDS SECURITY COUNCIL MEETING

LD070908 Moscow TASS in English 0854 GMT 7 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 7 TASS -- Lebanon has demanded the convocation of an urgent Security Council Meeting because of continued acts of aggression and repressions by the Israeli occupation forces in southern Lebanon. Israeli troops and their henchmen from the South Lebanese Army attacked with heavy mortar and machinegun fire the city of Nabatiyeh and six villages in the so-called "security zone" established by the invaders in the southern part of the country. Civilian casualties are reported. Israeli punitive units numbering over a thousand officers and men have been sent there.

CPSU'S BRUTENTS HOLDS SEMINAR ON MIDEAST

GF051516 Kuwait AL-WATAN in Arabic 4 Jan 86 pp 14-16

["Seminar" with Karen Brutents, deputy chief of the international Department of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in by Jasim al-Mutawwi', editor in chief of AL-WATAN; Sulayman Fulayhan, Ibrahim Rajab, and 'Abdallah al-Nibari (titles or positions not given); Ahmad Jabir, chief of AL-WATAN's Information Department; Muhammad Musa'id al-Salih, chairman of AL-WATAN's board of directors; Tawfiq Bakr, a Palestinian writer; Kuwaiti writer 'Abd al-Raziq al-Basir; Anwar al-Yasin, a contributor to AL-WATAN; Chanim al-Najjar, lecturer in political science at Kuwait University; and Mahmud al-Rimawi, AL-WATAN's editorial secretary; translation from Russian by Dr Ahmad al-Nu'man; in Kuwait -- date not given]

[Text] Jasim al-Mutawwi': I am pleased to welcome Dr Karen Brutents, deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee; Pogos Akopov, the Soviet ambassador to Kuwait; and Aleksandr Krasnov, APN chief editor for the Middle East and Africa [title as published] -- and APN is the main link between us. We welcome Dr Brutents and hope that our dialogue with him today will be enriching and fruitful, for the prominent guest plays an important and influential role in drawing up his country's policy, particularly in the Middle East.

When we discussed with our colleagues in APN inviting our friend Karen Brutents to Kuwait, we took the time factor into consideration -- the time factor as it pertains to world events and to our region. We were anxious to have the prominent guest with us prior to the Geneva summit so that we could become acquainted with the background of the issues to be discussed at the summit. However, owing to circumstances, this was not possible and our meeting was postponed. Then we were anxious to receive our friend Brutents in Kuwait after the Geneva summit, as it would be beneficial to hear from him more useful, detailed, and important information. When we invited some Kuwaiti figures to participate in this seminar we called it "the post-summit seminar."

Events then occurred rapidly: There was Iraqi President Saddam Husayn's visit to Moscow; tension between Syria and Israel escalated over the missiles issue; the question of Soviet arms in Libya gained prominence as the United States expressed "anxiety" at the presence of such weapons in Libya; and other events.

What is of primary importance to us -- in addition to what took place at the Geneva summit -- is to throw light upon the Iraqi-Iranian war, which is the main preoccupation of everyone in the Gulf region. Before the colleagues ask their questions, I invite Dr Brutents to give us a brief explanation about the Soviet Union in the present situation -- both with regard to what took place at the Geneva summit and with regard to Middle East developments. After that, questions may be asked and the discussion will begin.

Karen Brutents: My dear friends, first of all I want to greet all those present and through you I greet all employees of AL-WATAN and indeed all workers in the Kuwaiti press. I also thank my friend Jasim al-Mutawwi', AL-WATAN's editor in chief, and all officials of AL-WATAN and APN and all those who sought to bring about my meeting with you in an initiative that deserves great appreciation and interest.

The Geneva meeting has become an important and timely event in international life, not only in our view but also in the view and assessment of the rest of the world. This is clearly understood if we take into consideration the role of the USSR and the United States in international events. I frankly say that we have never believed and never will believe that we can, or even have the right, to determine solutions to issues which concern other peoples at a roundtable between the USSR and the United States only. All that has been said otherwise about this issue is pure lies or at least has nothing to do with facts.

When we talk about our role and the role of the United States, we proceed from an objective factor which was proved by events after World War II, because the nature of events and the overall interlocking relations in the contemporary international atmosphere have proved the important role which the USSR and the United States can play in the international arena.

First of all, was the Geneva summit up to the level of these events? There are many questions which should be answered.

Second, were the warnings, which were published in some Arab press that "the USSR seemed to have given concessions to the United States on the Middle East during the Geneva summit," true?

I can answer "yes" and "no" to the first question. As for the second question, I can say "no" and I cannot give any other reply to it.

If we go back to the first question, why both "yes" and "no", it is because the Geneva summit was held after 6 years during which there was no meeting at the summit level. Taking into consideration the role of both the USSR and the United States, this meeting made it incumbent to clear the atmosphere; the Geneva summit also created some sort of normalization in relations and added a sort of calmness to the relations between the two sides where both of them announced commitment to the principle that they would never seek means for military superiority or threaten each other's security. As we specifically said, a nuclear war in the current circumstances cannot be a political tool because there can be no victor. That is why this war should be excluded from such calculations. Lastly, the two sides announced their intention and willingness for disarmament, including a 50 percent reduction in the arms of both sides. This is the outcome. I will not discuss here cultural agreements which were concluded between the two sides. All that I have said is part of my "yes" reply to the first question. Now, was the Geneva summit up to events? From our point of view, this summit was not a small thing. But why did I say "no"? Because the summit's primary and main issue lies in the current circumstances -- disarmament, arms control, and in whether we can stop the pace of the frenzied armament running at increasing levels. I refer in particular to space arms which will lead to more tension and will aggravate threats to the world. We could not solve this issue. Both sides agreed that they would continue negotiations in order to resolve it.

The USSR believes there that there is an organic relationship among space armament, the militarization of space, the negotiations which are currently taking place to reduce other arms, and the panting after armament. But where does the essence of the Geneva summit lie? Can we achieve that which we said "yes" to and thus transform points of agreement into practical facts? Or will the agreements which were made never take a practical form? In other words, will these points of agreement be suppressed and deprived of the sustenance they need to survive? Such is the feature of the present moment through which the world is passing.

Now, how will events develop in the future? I cannot answer this question accurately and definitely since differences are continuing over this among the ruling circles in the United States. However, I can say that events in Geneva did not proceed in the way these circles wanted. These rightists wanted the meetings in Geneva to take a different course. The best example for this is Weinberger's well-known message, on which I will dwell [as published]. You know it well. The message contained many points referring to thse acute differences. After the Geneva summit the signs of these differences began to appear more clearly. While I cannot say what the outcome of this conflict will be, I have to say that its results will be decided by other countries. Here, I am not referring to our position, which will remain constant, strong, and realistic. In our view, threat is a means to which cowardly people resort. Threfore, we will continue our policies which do not accept vituperation. The concerned U.S. ruling circles are swimming against the current and are trying to follow an opposite course, thus stupidly staking on the outcome of pressures. Therefore, the matter depends on other countries and their positions.

We differ, with the view which says that the disarmament questions concern only the Soviet Union and the United States. On the contrary, we believe that these questions concern the destiny of mankind, especially since the Pentagon is pursuing a course that threatens the destiny of mankind. Therefore, we believe that all countries and peoples not only are concerned about this question and its results, but also have great responsibilities in thwarting the dangers of war, which does not distinguish between one country and another or one people and another, and which harms all without exception.

For example, you are all concerned about the Middle East issue, but you do not refer to the connection between the presence of arms in space and the Middle East issue, although such a connection does exist. In resolving the Middle East issue there should be normal relations between countries regardless of their interest and positions toward this issue in particular. This is what I call a relationship between regional issues and general issues. You can imagine the black destiny awaiting mankind if militarization of space is not stopped and if a catastrophe occurs. Therefore, the various international and regional issues concern this conflict or this struggle -- if it is right to say so. We have to be optimistic about this struggle and its results and we have to act vitally and actively to resolve this struggle and to achieve the required and desired results. I must, reemphasize that we in the Soviet Union will do all what we can to protect our position toward this question and to achieve good objectives even if through pressure. Regional issues, especially the Middle East issue, were discussed at the Geneva summit generally and not in detail, because at the beginning and before the summit the United States tried to give priority to regional issues and to push them forward, not for the purpose of settling these issues which concern this region or that, but for belittling the priority of the important and essential issues. In other words, the United States wanted to shed light on regional issues and to obscure the important and essential issues. Thus, the U.S. side dropped from its proposed program to the summit the South African and Middle East issues. Had the U.S. administration actually been interested in discussing regional issues, it would have put the Middle East issue at least on top of the issues proposed for discussion, because it is the most important regional issue in the world.

Had the Middle East issue been discussed, it would have been necessary to discuss the policy of piracy which Israel is practicing against the Arabs.

Briefly, regional issues were not included in the agenda of the American side. Since this issue was not discussed, we should conclude that we have not made [illegible] in this regard. Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev has stressed with determination and strength our method and stand toward solving the Middle East problem. First of all, what does this stand represent? It represents the fact that the region's peoples should have total freedom to choose their own method for their development and that no one under any umbrella should say, for example, that "this region is within our vital interests," because no one has the right to determine the fate of other peoples, or else such a policy will become the policy of an emperor. I must stress that we will confront such a policy in the future as we have confronted it in the past.

Secondly, each of these problems have their special roots. In our view, each regional issue or conflict which is created in the world and which becomes critical is a result of imperialist interferences in the world.

Thirdly, the Americans like to refer to "Moscow's hand" and they look for this hand in all crises. This is not true, especially with regard to the Middle East. In addition to imperialist interference in its [the Middle East's] internal affairs, there is the Israeli aggression which is playing a parallel and complementary role. Thus, I only raise this issue briefly.

Jasim al-Mutawwi': Thank you Dr Brutents for your explanation. I now open the door for other questions.

Sulayman Fulayhan: How does Dr Brutents link the escalation of Israeli statements and moves following the Geneva summit and other moves that are taking place in the Middle East arena, and the Israeli escalation in Lebanon and the attempt to hinder the solution which is taking place between the Lebanese and Syrian sides?

Brutents: Logically, I cannot go into those issues because I do not have information at hand to answer this question. But it is logical that I should link the escalation of statements and moves to the Israeli escalation in Lebanon. Naturally, Israel and those who stand behind it are not concerned about finding a solution to the Middle East crisis for two reasons: First, because such a solution could give the development of the events in Lebanon a dynamism for structural reconstruction inside, which would consequently bolster it as a state. If this were to happen, the ability to maneuver inside Lebanon would be hampered -- maneuvers that Israel is continuously practicing. This naturally would mean the bolstering of Lebanese resistance against Israeli aggression, particularly in southern Lebanon. Israel is currently doing what it likes on the borders because the situation in Lebanon permits it to do so.

Second, because Israel and those countries which stand behind it do not want a solution and normalization of issues and relations inside Lebanon. They want to involve Syria in Lebanese affairs so that their own hands can remain free there. Therefore, it is necessary to point out that everything done by Israel is linked in some way with an attempt to divert the Geneva results from their normal course. This attempt is also being made by certain other forces. The situation after Geneva has become more tense rather than calm and stable. Thus, in order to kill and abort the Geneva spirit, those forces to which we referred are not only trying with Israel to sabotage Soviet-U.S. relations, but they are also trying to make the world situation more tense.

Jasim al-Mutawwi': Let us continue to raise the question of the Arab-Israeli situation.

Ibrahim Rajab: What are your predictions on Israeli policy and the possibility of a limited confrontation between Israel and Syria in view of current developments in the region?

Brutents: I am reserved and cautious when there is talk about Israeli policy. However, I am totally certain that Israel and its allies want very much to see Syria involved in Lebanon and this is part of the U.S.-Israeli policy. Regarding U.S.-Israeli policy toward Syria, we can call it the policy of the "carrot and the stick." I was in Syria nearly a month ago and the Syrian officials told me that they do not rule out the possibility, and are even expecting that should Lebanon be able to resolve its crisis, then Israel will detonate the situation there. Thus, I reiterate that Israel dreams of intervening and is ready to proceed in the policy of obstructing the solution of the Lebanese crisis and can go a long way toward this.

There exists an internal political game among the Israeli circles. There are certain powers that want to collect "political points" for their individual interests and overthrow the government, or at least push the government into a tight corner by throwing all the responsibility on its shoulder by instigating racial issues and military provocations inside Israel and heating up the idea of "the beseiged fortress." As I said before, there are powers in Israel which are closely linked with certain friends and none of them want to see the normalization of international relations. All these circumstances make it difficult to make predictions on the future Israeli policy; however, in spite of all this there are a number of reasons that should restrain Israel. First of all, Israel should not use its military power to "joke" with Syria. Second, I do not think that the Israeli economy and its internal situation, particularly after its bitter experiences in Lebanon, will allow it to realize its hostile desires.

The Israeli economy, despite receiving continuous U.S. support, is unable to endure such an adventure. Thus, Israel should take into account the international situation and the stance of the Soviet Union. It should also be careful about the Arab stance. Perhaps my reply was not accurate. It is easy to say yes or no but still I have tried to reply as much as possible and the future will affirm what I said.

'Abdallah al-Nibari: Dr Brutents, you said that some circles in Israel are trying to put responsibility on the government. Did you mean the Israeli Government?

Brutents: Yes. They are placing some responsibility and also trying to detonate the situation in the current coalition government in order to make it an extreme rightist government as before.

Ahmad Jabir: Before everything else, we appreciate Soviet policy in its support of Arab causes. My question concerns the Iraq-Iran war. Many sources say that the United States is interested in the continuation of this destructive war in order to realize its ambitions in the region. What is the Soviet role in the current stage to end this war?

Brutents: What is our role in halting it? In the first place, our role is a political one. We have always been against this war. I do not need to discuss this issue in detail before my colleagues, because they are constantly following up the war. We have always adhered to a neutral stance toward both warring parties. However, we have never been neutral toward this war and we have never been neutral toward the stands of both parties toward the war. [sentence as published] That is why we have denounced the war from its beginning, because it serves neither Iraqi nor Iranian interests. Moreover, it will not solve any problems. This war, however, is serving the interests of imperialism. This is my belief. Developments in this war have confirmed this theory.

That is why we still condemn it. Time has proved our prophecies regarding the war. Both Iraq and Iran have made dear and horrible sacrifices for this war. I think that those who started the war bear most of the responsibility. We all must ask the following questions:

In whose interest is it that the bloodshed should continue? In whose interests is it that about 1/2 million people have been killed so far? We do not side with one party or the other. As I have said, we maintain neutral stances toward the war and toward the stands of both parties toward the war. We are faced with the following situation: One party wants to end the war, the other party seeks to continue the war until victory is achieved. We do not support the second party, because its stand has no future; it is a short-sighted stance, and is wrong, incorrect, and illogical. Our policy in this region is to condemn the war in general. We have also maintained such a stand on the international level. I believe that such a stand will, in the end, lead to a halt to the war. And I believe that our cooperation with Iraq in all fields will lead to an end to this war.

Jasim al-Mutawwi': The question is from 'Abd al-Razaq al-Basir, a well-known Kuwaiti writer. He is one of AL-WATAN's writers of whom we boast.

'Abd al-Raziq al-Basir: It is known that the Soviet Union in fact stands behind the liberation movements. But, with regard to the Iraq-Iran war, some of its Arab friends support the Iranian stance. While the Soviet Union has a clear stance toward this war, it must play a role with its friends. What is your opinion?

Brutents: Before I answer this question, I must finish my answer to the previous question because I did not refer to the U.S. stance in this regard. I believe that the United States has an interest in seeing the war continue for two reasons:

First, its continuation will allow the United States to enlarge its military presence in the region.

Second, this will weaken the activeness of the Arab steadfastness front against Israel. I have metaphorically used the word "front," because the Arab situation is far worse than that.

Thus one can conclude that the United States seeks to benefit from the continuation of the Iraq-Iran war, and to exploit the internal situation in Iran by bringing about changes that favor the United States and serve its interests. I have no doubt that the U.S. stand seeks to perpetrate and fan the flames of the war. If the Americans were to join us in adopting the same stand in opposing the war, or indeed if they were to adopt their own stand on condition that such a stand is realistic and opposes the war, we would achieve our ultimate goal of completely ending the war.

I do not rule out the possibility of our working together and agreeing to end the war. We, on our side, are prepared to do so. However, they -- that is the Americans -- do not want to end the war or even agree on ending it. In other words, if the Americans were to change their stand on the war I do not rule out the possibility of bringing about an end to the war.

I now return to answering the question put forward by Al-Basir. Our esteemed friend Al-Basir has asked a very important question and I believe that such a question has not occurred to him alone. Let us clarify this matter. We, of course, do not try and do not want to hide our stand on this issue, nor do we want to hide or cover up the stands of our friends on the war. You must realize the nature and essence of our relations with the Arabs. Political relations must be based on the equal rights of both parties, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. If we should establish friendships with some countries this does not mean that they should adopt stands similar to our stands. I do not disguise the fact that we do have differences and not only on this issue. Let us look at our relations with Kuwait, for example. They are good relations and I hope and wish that they will be better in the future. However, does anyone imagine that the Kuwaitis do not decide their policies themselves on all issues, without tutelage from any side? Therefore, I say that even among friends there can be different views and there can be differences. Therefore, I reiterate: Every side decides its policy independently. We also decide our policy oursleves and we put it forward to our friends, and it is their right to decide their policy by themselves, regardless whether in our view such a policy is sound or unsound.

Jasim al-Mutawwi': Abu 'Adnan ['abd al-Raziq al-Basir] meant Syria and Libya and supplying them with arms?

Brutents: All experience in international relations has shown that however good relations between states are, this does not mean that their views on all issues have to be identical. We know -- and it was not I but you who named the states -- that both Syria and Libya have certain stands, and we have certain stands. This of course applies to the Iraq-Iran war. We cannot imagine the contrary. We also put forward our stands to our friends and we explain to them such stands. We also declare our stands at all international forums. Once again, I affirm that Syria, Libya, and all countries decide their own stands themselves, and we, as I have said, explain our views to everyone.

Sulayman Fulayhan: Following Iraqi President Saddam Husayn's visit to Moscow, talks have centered on the possibility of supplying new arms to Iraq, and there have also been talks about activating the cooperation treaty between Iraq and the Soviet Union and about Soviet mediation between Baghdad and Damascus. We would like Brutents to shed light on this information and the degree of its correctness.

Brutents: I think this issue was not discussed specifically in such a way during the Moscow meeting. It is sufficient to mention that the Middle East issue in general was not omitted during our meetings with President Saddam Husayn.

Regarding Iraqi-Syrian relations, I would like to affirm that this is not the first time or the first year that we have played a role in the process of normalizing Syrian-Iraqi relations. These efforts of ours have not stopped, especially during the current international situation, because both of them are Arab and neighboring countries at the same time. But basically we must bear in mind in our action the dangers that distress the entire Arab world. Therefore, the discussions held recently did not exclude this issue. Our stand is well known, and we always affirm it. But inspite of all this, regrettably these efforts have not yielded success. It is very difficult to say that the recent discussions held in Moscow during Saddam Husayn's visit were more successful than the previous ones, especially if we review the recent statement of Taha Yasin Ramadan.

Soviet-Iraqi relations were discussed in general during the meetings in Moscow, including the cooperation between the two countries. All fields of cooperation were adequately discussed. Concerning the revival of the friendship and cooperation treaty between the Soviet Union and Iraq, I do not understand the meaning of the word "revival."

Jasim al-Matawwi': The next question is presented by Muhammad Musa'id al-Salih, chairman of the AL-WATAN board of directors.

Muhammad Musa'id al-Salih: Brutents said the Soviet Union is making efforts to end the Iraq-Iran war. Good. With whom is it exerting efforts? With the United States, for example? No, it does not agree to cooperate, according to Brutents' statement. With Syria and Libya? The Soviet Union cannot interfere in their internal affairs. When the Americans provide some party with arms, they stipulate that their friends must know how to handle and to use these weapons. Why is it not possible for the Soviet Union to stipulate that Syria and Libya should not use these arms against Iraq? I do not understand from your talk why a superpower such as the Soviet Union cannot exert pressure on Syria and Libya to prevent the use of their weapons against an Arab country -- Iraq? Therefore, with whom will the Soviet Union coordinate its efforts to stop the war?

Brutents: I repeat once again that if we were able to stop the war, we would do so tomorrow. Anyhow, our action in this regard continues to be as follows: First, our political stance. Sometimes our political stances are not all that very evident, but it is slowly achieving results in general. Second, our support stems from the fact that we will not allow victory to be achieved. This has in fact been successful because of our support.

Yes, we give arms to Syria and Libya with ordinary conditions, namely, without political restrictions and with unrestricted cooperation. These conditions are the characteristics of our policy in dealing with other countries. I cannot draw a parallel between the United States and ourselves on this issue or that. However, I emphasize that it is difficult to give more details on this issue. Our stand on this issue is very clear to our friends.

Muhammad Musa'id al-Salih: I understand how an Iranian victory cannot be achieved. But is it not possible to achieve an Iraqi victory?

Brutents: No, because the war has reached a deadlock and neither side can achieve victory in it. If we use chess jargon, the war has reached a point at which the king cannot be killed and no one can make any move or achieve a victory.

As for arms control for both sides, I believe that issues pertaining to arms are difficult to discuss openly in such a forum. We have different relations with Iraq and Iran; our cooperation with each side is different in extent and form.

Jasim al-Mutawwi': The question now is from Tawfiq Abu Bakr, a writer, a researcher, and an analyst of Palestinian, Arab, and international affairs.

Tawfiq Abu Bakr: The emigration of Soviet Jews is now being raised by the Arab and international press. The last to write about this issue was LE MONDE. The question is: Why was this issue raised in such a way on the eve of the Geneva summit? Why is it being raised nowadays? LE MONDE says that the USSR has agreed to allow 15,000 Soviet Jews to emigrate in return for an international conference on the Middle East issue.

Brutents: There is no truth in this. I want to draw our friends' attention to the fact that this uproar has been raised by western media many times. I believe that when an investigator begins to unravel the secret of a crime that has taken place, he begins by examining its motive before he reaches the truth. Perhaps you read in the western press about the extent of this so-called "emigration" of Soviet Jews. First, the figure was 15,000. Then they attributed the issue to Jaruzelski on the occasion of his visit to France, to imply that Poland is carrying out the role of mediator for the departure of Jews from the USSR via France. But what became clear? It became clear that this was not true and LE MONDE itself published this. But this was done in four lines on the third page. The denial was attributed to official French sources. Before that, they said France could play the role of mediator, and then they said France postponed this until later. After France, there was talk about Italy making the departure "an Italian style," [as published] as they said. Thus, everything in this connection was done in accordance with "bourgeois law" and the tactics of western propaganda. We are now in the midst of the third uproar. Who started this uproar? Whoever is behind it is dreaming of making a base for these campaigns in your countries, for as the saying goes, "there is no smoke without fire." But I want to emphasize that there is no fire behind this smoke. The emigration of Jews from the USSR and the emigration of any nationality or ethnic group is controlled by the USSR's laws, which in turn conform to the UN resolution adopted in 1966 on emigration from any country.

These laws apply to the Jews just as they apply to others. They are allowed to emigrate only on the basis of the "reunion of families." Those who are privy to state secrets and those who have served in the army and been discharged recently -- that is, those who still know some army secrets -- are excluded. Also excluded are those whose emigration will affect the freedom and rights of others, such as the emigration of the breadwinner of elderly parents, for instance. Those who do not have relatives abroad from the same family and of course prisoners and persons who are banned from travel for security reasons are not allowed to emigrate. This applies to Jews as well as to others, and there are absolutely no other exceptions for the Jews.

Let me cite some figures: In 1984 only 832 Jews emigrated from our country, and in 1985 only about 700 Jews emigrated, not more. I, in turn, want to ask Arab friends: Why be misled by such an uproar? I honestly say to you that if you are not misled by such an uproar it would not achieve its aims. The aims of creating such uproars are above all political aims; they are to create hostility between the Arab and the Soviets, drive a wedge in Arab-Soviet understanding, and cast doubts on our good relations. They carry out their propaganda according to the law of supply and demand. If there is no demand, then supply will be of no importance.

I say frankly: The calmer and more indifferent you are in the face of such claims, the more western propaganda will fail and lose its value. Many Jews who emigrate to Israel soon discover the truth about Zionist propaganda and try to return. However, as you know, the Soviet Union prevents them from returning. Why? When they leave the Soviet Union their apartments are given to other Soviet citizens. If they should return to the Soviet Union we would have to find them new apartments. In our country there are many who want to improve their housing and have been waiting to do so for a long time. In the Soviet Union apartments are allocated freely with no rent.

Why should we deprive those who have been waiting for apartments and give them to returning Jews? Why for? Do they expect us to award them medals for leaving their country and emigrating to other countries?

Should we decorate them with medals for betraying their homeland? When we allocate these apartments to war veterans, that is understandable. But what is totally not understandable is to allocate the apartments to those who have betrayed their country.

We say: Anyone who leaves us, let him go to hell, because we despise those who betray the homeland. I believe that all of us do not like those who do not love their homeland. However, I also say: The number of those who want to emigrate has fallen. This is because those who wanted to emigrate have already left and in large numbers. The others do not want to emigrate for various reasons, such as the fact that Israel is a military state, which means conscription into the army and constant wars.

One day before I left Moscow for Kuwait, I had some free time and by chance I went to the theater. The play, called "25 Shalom Aleykhom Street," is about a Jewish family in Odessa: a grandfather, a father, and grandchildren. One of the sons, a surgeon, wants to emigrate to Israel. He persuades his brother to emigrate to Israel. However, he deceives his brother who does not particularly want to go to Israel but wants to emigrate to another country. As you know, 80 percent of the Jews prefer to emigrate to the United States. However, none of the members of the family agrees to this, and a discussion on whether to stay or emigrate follows, with the two brothers insisting on emigrating.

There were many Jews among the audience in the theater. At the end of the discussion on the stage, the two sons say: We will not emigrate. Tumultuous and prolonged applause broke out in the theater. Thus I found myself once again in the middle of work, for the play was political and the subject was about Jews and emigration.

Al-Mutawwi': It is time to answer the question of Anwar al-Yasin, one of the Kuwaiti candidates to obtain a doctorate degree in England and one of AL-WATAN's writers.

Anwar al-Yasin: Does the Soviet leadership wish to restore diplomatic relations with Israel? Please elaborate if the answer is no?

Al-Mutawwi': Dr Ghanim al-Najjar, a teacher of political sciences at Kuwait University and one of AL-WATAN's active writers wants to add something to this question.

Ghanim al-Najjar: My question is similar to the previous question, so I would like Dr Brutents to speak a little about recent rumors concerning the existence of relations between some socialist countries and Israel. What is the position of the Soviet Union toward this question, since the socialist countries are its allies?

Brutents: It is natural for diplomatic relations to exist among all countries, including Israel. Israel has become a recognized fact. It is situated in the Middle East region and that is why we have interest in it. However, the question is not as simple as that. We severed our relations with Israel not because of ethnic sensitivity or as a temporary reaction, but because of its continuous aggression against the Arab people, its attacks against the Arab countries, and the hostile policies it is pursuing. For these objective reasons we severed our relations with it. These reasons have not yet vanished. The essence of the issue lies in this point. It is not a question of mood. If the situation was normal, we would welcome the restoration of relations with it and would help create a favorable atmosphere for stability in the region.

Perhaps such a situation could have prompted Israel to listen in a better way. It is now dominated by the United States. It no longer listens to anything. Had it listened well, we would have told it a lot. Relations with it are possible if it changes its policy and removes the obstacles that prevent the restoration of such relations. We also believe that Israel is keen to restore relations with us for many known reasons. This is how the situation is. With regard to the outcry over this matter, I ask my friends again to remain calm about this outcry.

By the socialist countries I think you mean Poland and Hungary. The principled positions of these countries have not changed at all. I also believe that they will not take any step to restore relations with Israel. There will also be no relations with Israel in the future so long as it remains a base for aggression.

Al-Mutawwi': This means that there will be no relations with Israel so long as it remains a base for aggression and so long as it adheres to its current policy?

Brutents: Yes. What I said in this regard is clear and understandable.

Al-Mutawwi': It is the turn of colleague Muhammad al-Rimawi, AL-WATAN's editorial secretary, to ask his question.

Muhammad al-Rimawi: There is talk about new Soviet mediation between Syria and the PLO. Is there any hope that this mediation will succeed despite the crisis in relations between Syria and the PLO? It is also said that the Soviet Union and the PLO are continuously exchanging messages. Have you invited 'Arafat to visit Moscow?

Brutents: Many reports speak about several messages. However, this is not true. There are different views concerning the Palestinian issue. We may not agree with all these views.

With regard to relations between Syria and the PLO, we believe that national relations and broad and amicable cooperation between the PLO and the Palestinians who are steadfast in their struggle against Israel, on one hand, and Syria on the other, are the cornerstone of this struggle. I believe that a Palestinian policy of opposing imperialism, Zionism and aggression would not be consistent with a policy of hostility toward Syria. Friendship with Syria is an absolute necessity for the continuation and strength of an effective role for the Palestinians in solving the Middle East crisis and also -- as I said -- in order to resist Israeli and U.S. projects and policy in the region.

On the other hand, Syria also needs Palestinian cooperation with it, particularly if we consider the weight and the role of the Palestinians in the conflict in the region and the role of Palestinians in general. In our view, this adherence, solidarity, and unity is very important. Thus, we have stood and we will stand and work in this direction in the future.

As for inviting Yasir 'Arafat to Moscow, I do not have any information on such an invitation. We have contacts with Yasir 'Arafat, although the Amman agreement has had its effect on those contacts. We do not put the matter within the framework that Yasir 'Arafat is the PLO and that the PLO is 'Arafat. We cannot link all our relations with the Palestinian people's liberation movement to those with 'Arafat. Our relations are with the PLO provided that the PLO is strong, unified and hostile to imperialism and Zionism. Our relations are also with the unity of the Arab peoples' struggle alongside the Palestinians, while we do not interfere in the other sides.

Al-Mutawwi': The question is for Marwan Hazin, director of AL-WATAN's foreign affairs department.

Marwan Hazin: My question consists of three parts:

First, Do you believe that the Jordanian-Syrian reconciliation will effect the PLO negatively or positively in the future, and does the reconciliation effect the Amman agreement? Second, talk in the Soviet Union about the current crisis in the Palestinian arena has died down, even though this crisis is becoming more serious day by day. We would like to know what recent efforts you have made to end this crisis, considering that the Palestinian issue is one to which you pay special attention. Third and last, in a press conference he held in Kuwait recently, Abu Iyad said that there used to be a cloud over relations between the PLO and the Soviet Union. He did not say between 'Arafat and the Soviet Union following the signing of the Amman agreement. What happened to this cloud, considering that the Amman agreement between 'Arafat and Jordan is still in effect?

Brutents: With regard to the cloud, this is more an ethical expression than a political one. We evaluate the Amman agreement as a negative factor. With regard to this issue, nothing in our stance has changed. I also know that our Kuwaiti friends were not pleased with it.

We know very well about the significance of the Palestinian issue, which is the cornerstone of the Middle East problem and its settlement. We appreciate the role that was played by the Palestinians and also the role that they can play in the future, particularly in confronting the separate and liquidationist agreements and deals.

As our Kuwaiti friends know, we have done a great deal to help the PLO so that it will be strong and cohesive and so that its international role will be strengthened and its international reputation enhanced. We have received the Palestinians and assisted them when no one else did so -- not in Asia, Europe, or anywhere else. Our relationship with the Palestinians is above all a humanitarian one. We have been touched by the hardships faced by the Palestinians and explained this to our people and asked them to share the Palestinians' sorrows with them. Our press, radio and television, and Soviet politicians and social figures have often talked about this matter. A great deal was said about Palestine and the Palestinians. Every child and every pupil at school knows and supports the Palestinian question. In our country, for instance, they know 'Arafat, Qaddumi, and the other Palestinian leaders more than they know the leaders of most other countries.

After all that, we suddenly find that the Palestinian hand has signed the Amman agreement, which does not endorse the rights of the Palestinian people, does not mention the role of the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and makes no reference to an independent Palestinian state. In other words, they have begun to destroy what they built over many years with their very own hands. It is not a question of a cloud in Soviet-PLO relations, nor can it be attributed to "other natural phenomena," for it is a question of a political line. If the Palestinian line is anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist, then the sun is shining above us in its full glory. We do not have predetermined plans against anyone. The issue is determined by political stands and by the political line adopted and nothing else.

As for how the Jordanian-Syrian rapprochement will affect this, it is difficult to answer this question now. At any rate, I hope that the Amman agreement will not be yet another factor that obstructs Arab solidarity and the Arabs' solidarity with the Palestinians. Consequently, we support and salute all steps that will lead to the strengthening of solidarity among the Arabs, because such steps are compatible with their national interests.

Al-Mutawwi': There is one last issue that has not been discussed, and that is the Afghan question. Can you explain the Soviet view on that issue, and we will thus have completed discussing the various issues of interest to us in the region?

Brutents: Let us place all the pawns in their places on the chessboard so that we can see the development of events as they really occured in Afghanistan and around Afghanistan. First, we were not the ones who brought about all those events in Afghanistan. I was in Afghanistan twice. The first time Taraki said to me: "You have a colleague in the CPSU Central Committee, a professor, and the following discussion took place between us: I said to your colleague: 'Afghanistan is now ready for a revolution.' The professor replied: 'No, the time is not yet ripe for a revolution. The country is backward and it is not yet time for a revolution.'" Taraki added: "Who was right? We have carried out the revolution and here you and I are in the presidential palace. Convey my greetings to your colleague and tell him that we do not learn everything from books."

I gave this example to tell you that the revolution and the events belong to the Afghan people. We entered [Afghanistan] at the request of the Afghanis, not at our own desire. During the years 1978-1979 the Afghan government repeatedly requested our military aid to deter Pakistani military interference in the country. We postponed our response to this request several times. The first time was at the outskirts of Herat [as published] and we received numerous other requests to come to the aid of Afghanistan. We want to withdraw from there as soon as possible. The sooner we execute this step the better it will be. This is our reply to the propaganda claims that we want to stay in Afghanistan indefinitely and that we want to attain the old dreams of the czars to possess the warm waters. All that has been written in this regard, spilling tons of ink, is mere lies and hypocrisy. They say that we dream of this as if we do not have warm waters. This is how I want to start my discussion of the Afghan issue.

We are keen to solve the Afghan issue politically. Such a solution is possible. Our position is defined as published in PRAVDA on 21 December. I would like to advise you to read this position because it is frank and clear. It also coincides with the position of the Afghan government, which calls for a political dialogue with the various political and social powers in the country, even with those who are adopting an antagonist position toward the Afghan revolution. They in turn, the Afghan officials, announced that such people are liable to take part in the government. This is the Soviet-Afghan position, which is designed to solve the Afghan issue politically. This reflects sincere intentions. When this happens, the Soviet forces will withdraw from Afghanistan.

Who do you think impedes the implementation of these peaceful efforts? The first factor is the military interference in Afghanistan. In order to discuss the issue at the negotiation table, arrangements [will have to be made] for the elimination of military powers. I mean by this Pakistan and what stands behind Pakistan, which is the United States. I said once, and I repeat myself by saying that there are over a 100 camps and bases in Pakistan which train those opposed to the Afghan revolution.

Pakistanis and Americans work there. A number of these Pakistani experts were captured in Afghan territory. As for the United States, it provided $400 million to those opposed to the Afghan revolution last year. Therefore, no one should expect us to withdraw our forces from there and to pave the way for those opposed to the revolution. This will only take place after the elimination of the foreign interference that I discussed earlier.

Al-Mutawwi': In your name, we express gratitude and thanks to Dr Karen Brutents for patiently and clearly answering the questions. We hope that the next dialogue will be as fruitful as this one has been. We hope to meet with the grand guest at AL-WATAN's offices with the same good spirit that prevailed in this meeting. We would like to thank our Soviet friends, his excellency the Soviet ambassador and our old friend Krasnov, and hope that these meetings will be fruitful and will help enhance Kuwaiti-Soviet friendship.

PDRY'S PREMIER PRAISES NEAR EAST POLICY

PM061523 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No. 1 27 Dec 85-2 Jan 86 (Signed to Press 26 Dec 85) p 4

[Interview with Haydar Abu Bakr al-'Attas, member of the Yemen Socialist Party Central Committee Politburo and prime minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, by V. Makharev, chief of the APN Bureau in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, under the general heading "The Soviet Union's Leninist Foreign Policy Gives All Mankind Confidence in a Peaceful Future": "'This Policy Benefits All the World's Peoples'"]

[Excerpt] The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen [PDRY], like other peace-loving states, fully supports the initiatives of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries imbued with concern for mankind's present and future and takes an active part in the measures of international organizations aimed at preserving peace. The PDRY also makes its contribution to the common cause of peace by activating efforts to ensure security and stability on the Arabian Peninsula and in the Persian Gulf and Horn of Africa region. We are doing everything possible to upset the plans of the imperialists, who are seeking to step up their military presence in our region, create their own military bases here for aggressive purposes, hold maneuvers of their air and naval forces, and periodically organize a provocative show of strength.

Together with other Arab peoples we are waging a persistent struggle against all manifestations of aggression and expansion being carried out by Israel with the assistance and support of the United States and its NATO allies. This struggle is part of the general flow of actions by the planet's peace-loving forces. The development of events in one of the world's hottest spots, in the Near East, attests to the futility of the attempts by imperialism and Israeli Zionism to impose their will on the Arabs with the help of diktat and aggression and to trample on their legitimate rights.

The Palestinian problem is undoubtedly at the heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Its just settlement is impossible without the liberation of the Israeli-occupied Arab territories and the recognition of the right of the Arab people of Palestine to return to their lands, the right to decide their fate themselves, the right to create their own independent national state. We see the speediest convening of an international conference on this question with the participation of all the interested sides, including the PLO as the Palestinian people's sole legitimate representative, as the real path guaranteeing all the conditions for a really just and lasting peace in the Near East.

SOVIET-ETHIOPIAN TRADE TIES DESCRIBED

LD021718 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 2 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 2 TASS -- Ethiopia is one of the Soviet Union's main African trading partners. The volume of bilateral trade has grown by 79.5 million roubles to 237.4 million roubles in the first nine months of 1985 compared with the corresponding period the previous year, a spokesman for the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Foreign Trade told a TASS correspondent. The Soviet Union exports machines, equipment, transportation means to Ethiopia while Soviet import is made up of Ethiopia's staple exports, including coffee.

The joint construction of various economic projects such as plants, factories and power stations is an important sphere of the equal Soviet-Ethiopian trade and economic cooperation. This form of cooperation embraces prospecting for minerals, industry, agriculture, water conservancy and other branches.

A tractor assembly work and an oil processing plant have been built and put into operation in Ethiopia with Soviet participation. Reclamation of Ethiopia's vast agricultural region, Gambela, is well under way.

The two sides attach great importance to creating a solid power basis of Ethiopian economy. With Soviet technical assistance, Ethiopia is constructing a big hydropower station "Melka Wakana". When put into operation, the station will increase the country's total power capacity by more than 50 percent.

"Melka Wakana" will supply additional electric power to Ethiopia's capital Addis Ababa, as well as to a number of industrial regions.

Other socialist countries also assist Ethiopia in its economic development. Together with the Soviet Union Czechokoslovakia delivers equipment for the "Melka Wakana" hydropower station.

MAGAZINE CITED ON CIA OPERATIONS IN AFRICA

PM061912 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Own Correspondent A. Serbin dispatch under the rubric "The Press Testifies": "The CIA Is Responsible"]

[Text] Addis Ababa, 2 Jan -- "The conclusion to be drawn by African governments is that they must prepare for a regrouping of CIA forces in Africa, with its agents trying from now on to act with greater sophistication than before." the journal NEW AFRICAN writes in connection with the latest exposures of this organization's subversive work in the African continent, and specifically following the exposure of a CIA "nest of spies" (the journal's expression -- A.S.) in Ghana.

The journal notes that this has embarrassed CIA agents in Burkina Faso, Togo, Benin, and the Ivory Coast, and has also led to the exposure of a network of CIA operatives in Kenya. In view of the difficulties, the CIA is now resorting to using for its own purposes Israel's intelligence service -- Mossad -- which, following the resumption of Israel's diplomatic relations with Liberia and Zaire, enjoys greater "operational scope" in Africa.

Among other materials on CIA activities, NEW AFRICAN publishes an interview with John Stockwell, a former agent of the department who worked in Africa. The interview describes in detail the CIA's subversive actions against Angola, against which all means were used -- ranging from the spreading of false rumors via the press to the recruitment of mercenaries and arms deliveries to counterrevolutionary gangs. The CIA is also directly responsible for the escalation of tension in Angola, J. Stockwell pointed out.

J. Stockwell noted that vast numbers of CIA operations involve the developing countries. Having listed Congo, Ghana, Brazil, Chile, Thailand, and others among them. He declared that CIA is waging a war against the "Third World." At least a million people have fallen victim to the U.S. espionage and subversion department in this war. J. Stockwell noted.

REUNION CP LEADER ALLEGES CIA ACTIVITIES

LD061153 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT 6 Jan 86

[Text] Antananarivo, January 6 TASS -- The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency is striving to expand the American presence in the Indian Ocean and set up its strongpoints in the strategically sensitive region, according to Paul Verges, general secretary of the Reunion Communist Party.

Speaking at a news conference in Saint-Denis, he exposed close links between reactionary forces in Reunion, a French overseas department, and the American espionage agency. Verges cited facts pointing to cooperation between Jean-Paul Virapouillet, leader of the right-wing opposition on the island, and the World Anti-Communist League with American secret services standing behind it.

The journalists attending the news conference were shown a videotape about the League's activities in various parts of the world. Last September Virapouillet and his crony J.J. Savaranen attended a conference held by that terrorist organization in Dallas, Texas. Right after the anti-communist gathering, says the newspaper TEMOIGNAGES of the Reunion Communist Party, Virapouillet threw himself into busy activity, forming and consolidating connections with representatives of right-wing forces in Indian Ocean states. It is with this purpose in mind, in particular, that the placeman of American secret services visited Mauritius. They in Langley are giving close attention also to Virapouillet himself. A group of Mormon missionaries recently were issued tourist visas to visit the island. But it is well-known, TEMOIGNAGES observed, that the C.I.A. frequently sends its agents to independent countries under the guise of clergymen. That has happened, for example, in New Caledonia and Tahiti.

The aim of the C.I.A.'s interference in the affairs of Reunion, said Verges, is to destabilize the situation on the island and prevent its people from deciding urgent political, social and economic problems themselves. Countries in the region have been the target for acts of sabotage, provocations, incursions by mercenaries and other subversive actions paid for by the C.I.A. on more than one occasion, he recalled.

PONOMAREV RECEIVES PERUVIAN CONGRESSMAN 1 JAN

PM070943 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Conversation at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has received Armando Villanueva, secretary general of the Popular Party -- American Popular Revolutionary Alliance and senator of the National Congress of Peru. A. Villanueva conveyed a message of greetings to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary from Peruvian President A. Garcia. During their friendly conversation they touched on certain questions regarding the international situation and Soviet-Peruvian relations.

DE LA MADRID REJECTS U.S. PRESSURE ON C. AMERICA

LD042135 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1640 GMT 4 Jan 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] In an atmosphere of acute differences on questions concerning a settlement of the conflict in Central America, the routine meeting between De la Madrid and Reagan, the presidents of Mexico and the United States, which took place in the Mexican border town of Mexicali, has ended. During the course of the meeting Mexico resoulutely rejected a new attempt to be inclined toward supporting the United States, which is conducting a policy of aggression and economic and political diktat in Central America. De la Madrid stated in particular that Mexico will continue to take an active part in searching for peaceful ways to settle the Central American conflict. From Reagan's statement in Mexicali it follows that the United States intends to continue interfering in the domestic affairs of Central American countries and fully supporting antipopular reactionary regimes in the region.

LATEST U.S. MANEUVERS TO 'INTIMIDATE' NICARAGUA

LD041618 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1131 GMT 4 Jan 86

[Text] Managua, 4 Jan (TASS) -- According to reports received here, U.S. "Terencio Sierra-86" military maneuvers, which will last until May of this year have begun in Honduras. Pentagon strategists intend to raise the combat readiness of their troops and to strengthen the military infrastructure on the territory of Honduras in the event of intervention against Nicaragua. Into the area of the Honduran populated localities of San Lorenzo, Jocon and La Puentecica the United States intends to transfer more than 4,500 soldiers and officers, to train for and practice waging combat actions in natural conditions similar to those in Nicaragua.

The latest maneuvers serve to maintain the atmosphere of tension in the region, to put pressure on the Nicaraguan Government and to intimidate it. According to data from the Nicaraguan Ministry of Defense, in the 6 years since the victory of the Sandinista people's revolution more than 70,000 U.S. servicemen have undergone training in Central America during military maneuvers conducted on the territories of countries where there are pro-U.S. dictatorships in power. During exercises scenarios have been played out for the invasions of various countries, with the participation of units of the U.S. Air Force and ground forces, and U.S. warships, including nuclear powered aircraft carriers.

CHILEAN SOCIALISTS SEND APPEAL TO ARMED FORCES

PY241759 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2130 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] The Socialist Party of Chile, [PSCH] has released a declaration addressed to the Chilean Armed Forces saying that it is possible and necessary to seek a reconciliation between the people and the Armed Forces as soon as possible. The declaration calls on the Armed Forces to participate in national activities on the basis of subordination to the authorities elected by the sovereign will of the people. It says that as democrats, the Socialists must struggle for the reestablishment of an authentic democratic government and that to achieve this goal it is necessary that the will of all Chileans, civilians and military men, converge on that goal.

The PSCH says that in order to build a solid democracy, it will be necessary to make the Armed Forces ideology, structure, and culture democratic, to dismantle the security organizations, to eradicate the national security doctrine, and to bring the people responsible for crimes and torture against humanity to trial.

The declaration addressed to the Chilean Armed Forces says that Chileans are facing a crucial point in their history in which the preservation of Chile as a nation is at stake, and that in this situation it is urgent that the members of the Armed Forces return to the ideals of independence advocated by our forefathers O'Higgins and Carrera, who gave birth to our nation, and that the members of the Armed Forces can no longer be forced to continue obeying Pinochet's arbitrary orders.

The PSCH document goes on to say that officers, as soldiers and citizens, have the duty to oppose those who are willing to drown the country in bloodshed to prevent Chile from returning to democracy. Every soldier has the moral obligation and the right as a citizen to debate, with his comrades in arms, the dramatic situation into which the country has been dragged by the Armed Forces and to seek prospects for change.

The PSCH declaration adds that the Armed Forces should spare the people any more pain and prevent greater material destruction of Chile. In conclusion, the communique calls on all Chilean soldiers, without regard to rank, to fully assume their obligation stemming from their oath to serve the country.

FACTIONS IN PARAGUAY CLASH OVER POLITICAL REFORMS

PY011716 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish to Latin America 0130 GMT 27 Dec 85

[Text] Dictator Stroessner has decided to purge the military high command in Paraguay, according to information carried by the British magazine LATIN AMERICAN REPORT. Consequently, Generals German Martinez, Gustavo Prieto, Eduardo Sanchez, Enrique Duarte, and others will be separated from the Armed Forces. The analysts consider such a measure to be the worsening in 1985 of the power struggle among various small groups of the ruling class. This struggle is surfacing because the despot will probably walk off the stage in the near future, if only because he is getting old. Some factions of Stroessnerists seem to be taking the upper hand. Likewise, in the Army, two tendencies can be noticed: the so-called civilian faction and the so-called militants.

A similar process has taken place within the ruling Colorado Party leadership. Both Colorado factions openly clashed in a party convention last September. The militant faction questioned a proposal concerning the nomination of the tyrant's successor and proposed that Stroessner's son, Gustavo, be elected to replace his father. Longtime Colorado Party leaders and some generals objected to this proposal, thus giving way to the conflict that is still going on today.

The conduct of the United States draws attention because working behind the scenes, they are trying to control the struggle among these factions. Judging by this, the gringos frown upon the mounting animosity within government circles because it can entice coupist elements in the Armed Forces, thus endangering the system of relations, including those with the United States. To prevent this, the embassy of Yankeeland in Asuncion has initiated contacts with several political forces, including those of the legally recognized opposition. It has been learned in well-informed sources that pressure has been exerted on Stroessner to cool off passions and guarantee the system of order that he established.

The recent decision to purge the generals shows that the militant faction, which is made up of ultraconservative young opportunists, has prevailed. The young militants are staunch supporters of Stroessner's ideas, proof of which was their proposal that Gustavo Stroessner be nominated to replace his father. Of course, Washington looks at them favorably because they do not intend to change anything. Furthermore, it was Washington that gave Stroessner the signal to get rid of those capable of disrupting his dictatorial system.

The truth is that what Washington fears most is the intensification of a popular movement demanding profound changes to preserve national interests that could ultimately culminate in a revolution. We must say that the events of 1985 show this movement has gained strength.

Workers, students, and peasants have taken many public actions to fight for their political and economic rights during the past 12 months. These actions were staged both in the capital and throughout the nation. People are rising against arbitrariness and misery both in downtown Asuncion and in the countryside. The struggle is being led by the Legal National Accord [a coalition of opposition parties], the Independent Union Movement, peasant associations, progressive priests, and banned parties such as the Paraguayan Communist Party.

Conditions for the formation of a single antidictatorial front have improved in 1985. A basic platform has been established. The dictatorship should be replaced by a provisional democratic civilian-military government, repressive decrees should be repealed, and a general amnesty snould be decreed to free all political prisoners. Paraguayan democratic forces are planning to implement major socioeconomic changes and an agrarian reform; they also want to get rid of foreign capital, and to promote national production.

In the face of these legitimate demands, Stroessner and his political protectors have no other argument but to resort to terror and to opportunistic maneuvers such as the expulsion from the Army of a handful of officers charged with involvement in repression against the people and in financial swindles.